



Agenda

Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board
September 9, 2014 3:00 PM
Board of Supervisors' Conference Room
1415 E Melody Lane, Building G
Bisbee, AZ 85603

3:00 PM **Call to Order**
 Roll Call (Introduce Board members, and explain quorum)
 Determination of Quorum
 Approval of Previous Minutes

OLD BUSINESS

Item 1 – Docket BC-14-01 (Opt-Out Language): Consider a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to revise the existing Cochise County Building Safety Code Owner-Builder Amendment Options. The revisions are intended only to improve clarity and remove contradictory language.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 2 – Annual Election for Chair and Vice-Chair.

Item 3 – Docket BC-14-02 (Adoption of 2012 ICC Building Safety Codes): Consider a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to adopt the 2012 International Code Council's published code series to reflect changes in industry process and technology to further protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

Item 4 – Docket BC-14-03 (Update Fee Schedule): Consider a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to update the current Planning, Zoning, and Building Safety fee schedule to reflect 'real cost' of the department in travel and manpower.

Item 5 – Call for Building Official's Report.

Item 6 – Call for Adjournment.

**COCHISE COUNTY BUILDING CODE ADVISORY AND APPEALS BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES**

**Wednesday, September 25, 2013
FIRST ANNUAL MEETING at 3:00 p.m.**

The installation and annual meeting of the Cochise County Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by Planning Director Beverly Wilson at the Cochise County Complex, 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, Arizona in the Board of Supervisors' Executive Conference Room.

As this was the initial meeting of this Board, everyone was asked to introduce themselves. There was no formal roll call, but let the record show those present: Michael Rutherford, Rutherford Diversified Industries; Ray Klumb, Architect; Bill Henry, Henry Design Build; Kim Mulhern, Geologist; Mike Hemesath, Civil Engineer; and Bill Miller, Chief, Fry Fire District. Staff members present included Britt Hanson, Chief Deputy Civil County Attorney; Beverly Wilson, Planning Director and Interim Building Official; Dave Estelle, Building Inspector; James Montoya, Senior Building Inspector; Mike Springer, Lead Building Inspector; and Lee Sipe, Senior Inspector and Plans Examiner. Ms. Wilson noted the absence of James Olander, Electrician. A quorum was present.

Mr. Hanson counseled the group on the Open Meeting Law and then informed the group that there was a question as to the legality of the meeting. An incomplete agenda had been posted on the web-site. There was consensus to proceed with the meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Ms. Wilson opened the floor for nominations for Chairman. Chief Miller nominated Mr. Hemesath who declined the nomination. Mr. Hemesath nominated Mr. Rutherford for Chair, the nomination seconded by Chief Miller. There being no further nominations, Ms. Wilson closed the nominations and called for a vote. Unanimously, Mr. Rutherford was elected as Chair; however, he abstained from the vote. The meeting was turned over to Chair Rutherford, who opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chair. Mr. Hemesath nominated Chief Miller; motion was seconded by Bill Henry. Chief Miller was unanimously elected as Vice-Chair of this Board. Chair Rutherford affirmed that the Building Official will act as the Secretary.

Item 1

Docket BC-13-01 (Self-Certification Policy): A request for an amendment to the adopted 2003 International Building Code (IBC) and the 2003 International Residential Code (IRC) to allow the Building Official to accept self-certified plans from Arizona Registrants.

Chairman Rutherford called for the Building Official's report. Interim Building Official, Beverly Wilson presented the docket, and explained that the request was the final step in an already approved policy from the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The Self-Certification Policy was approved by the BOS in June of 2013, and offers a voluntary alternative to County plans review. It is meant to save cost for Applicants and requires both Registrant and Applicant to agree to participate in the option. Staff recommended that language be added to the IBC and the IRC to allow this option to be accepted by the Building Official.

Ms. Mulhern asked if this option was for one certain Registrant or for multiple. Ms. Wilson affirmed that it was meant for those Arizona Registrants who are licensed by the Arizona Board of Technical Registration.

Mr. Klumb asked if this policy applied to both Residential and Commercial applications. Staff affirmed that it did apply to both.

Chair Rutherford stated that this Policy, as presented, was limited to Architects or Engineers, however, when first presented to the Southeast Arizona Contractors Association, it was open for both Contractors and Registrants. Ms. Wilson clarified that it was limited to Registrants based on the input from SACA and others. Chair Rutherford stated that this was a much better option.

Mr. Klumb stated that he disagreed with this policy as submitting a set of perfect plans can be difficult and he appreciates the review from County staff. He asked if inspections would still be performed; staff affirmed that inspections would still be performed.

Ms. Wilson reaffirmed that the Self-Certification Policy is already in effect; this discussion is to make a recommendation to the BOS on adding language to the ICC and the IBC to reflect the approved policy.

Chair Rutherford agreed with Mr. Klumb in that submitted plans rarely come back approved. He expressed concern that a contractor could find the self-certified plans to be deficient during construction which would result in angst between the owner, the Registrant, and the contractor. He sees this option as a potential for higher costs to an owner if the code isn't met.

Mr. Henry relayed a situation in which an Architect from New York designed a home built near the Dragoons. The owner opted out of the building code inspections, but had serious problems with the structure. Mr. Henry was asked to repair the problems; however, after consulting with a structural engineer and an independent home inspection service, the structure had to be destroyed. It was a \$1.6 million project and he feels that not having plans reviewed by the County could be very detrimental in a lot of cases.

After further discussion on who might utilize this option, Chief Miller made a motion to forward this docket to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation that this language NOT be added to the Building Codes. Mr. Klumb seconded this motion. Chair Rutherford called for the vote, it was unanimous.

Motion: Motioned to recommend that the Self-Certification language NOT be added to the Building Codes.

Action: Recommend the language NOT be added to the Building Codes **Moved by:** Chief Miller **Seconded by:** Mr. Klumb

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 6, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Chairman Rutherford, Chief Miller, Mr. Hemesath, Ms. Mulhern, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Klumb.

Item 2

Docket BC-13-02 (Fire Sprinkler Systems): This proposed amendment to the adopted 2003 International Fire Code (IFC) is to change the methodology of calculating the maximum area prior to the requirement for a fire sprinkling system for residential construction only.

Section B104.1 General of the IFC would be amended to read: *"Fire flow calculation area for R-3 Residential uses shall include only the living area of the structure and shall exclude garages, storage uses other than closets, and exterior porches."*

Chair Rutherford asked for the Building Official's report. Ms. Wilson presented the docket which is a request to include the above language to the adopted IFC, which will be less restrictive than the current adopted language. This request originated from the Contractor community during a Work Session with the Board of Supervisors in April of 2013. The 2006, 2009, and 2012 IFC are less restrictive than the 2003 version in the method of calculating the total square footage when applying the fire sprinkler requirements to a set of plans for a single family residential use.

The cost to applicants is further increased in the rural areas of the County as these systems require a constant water pressure. This involves upgrades in pumps and storage tanks for rural residences. The fire sprinkler system is not designed to extinguish a fire in a single family residence, but to provide enough time for residents to escape a fire. These systems are not designed to save property, but to save lives.

Sierra Vista has adopted the 2012 code, while Benson has exempted fire sprinkler requirements from their code. The proposed language is a middle ground and will relieve some cost burden from applicants, while maintaining the function of providing an escape from a potential fire.

Chair Rutherford asked Chief Miller about the number of fires starting in garages and closets. Chief Miller did not have a percentage, but stated that more fires are started inside the residential home. Fires inside garages are the second most common. He also stated that he had no problem with this proposed language especially in the rural areas as the cost is prohibitive to install the water system required. He expressed more concern with ensuring that smoke detectors are installed inside homes.

Chair Rutherford stated that his thought was that this should be a mandatory minimum, and that if anyone wanted to sprinkle their closets and garages they should be allowed to. Staff agreed that County policy is to always allow more than the code requirements if the applicant proposes to do so.

Mr. Klumb asked if there were a lot of homes being built that met the square foot requirements for fire sprinklers. Staff affirmed that over the past year many homes did meet the minimum 3,600-square foot minimum and did install additional fire walls or sprinklers to meet the code.

Mr. Henry stated that each time the fire sprinkler issue was broached with his clients, usually during plan review; the clients overwhelmingly did not want them. They didn't want to pay the \$1.25-square foot minimum to install them. While he appreciates this new language and sees it as a much better solution than the existing language, he has almost lost work over this code

requirement. He would rather see options in the code for applicants to make the choice of installing or not installing fire sprinklers. He feels that nine out of 10 custom homeowners would opt out of this mandatory requirement which adds approximately \$4,000 to the cost of a custom home.

Mr. Klumb affirmed that Staff was not proposing an opt out option. He also stated that if the property was correctly zoned, a 3,000-square foot home could be built with a 600-square foot guest house. Other options were discussed, such as fire walls and fire doors.

Mr. Henry reaffirmed that this language is a good compromise between the current requirements and the option Benson took – removing all reference to the sprinklers.

Chief Miller stated that he feels it is a life safety issue, and fire sprinklers in the livable space do allow residents a chance to escape a fire. He feels the language is very reasonable.

Mr. Henry's concern is the cost of the permit. He feels that while the language is reasonable, the bottom line cost is important to him and to his clients.

Ms. Mulhern stated that with the cold winters we've recently experienced, it surely makes sense to not require sprinklers in unheated areas of a home. Mr. Klumb stated that this is a good point, as the sprinklers are generally placed in the attic. He also clarified that the discussion was not about requiring sprinklers or not, it was about the calculation of the livable space.

Chair Rutherford asked if anyone had any information of savings in insurance if the house was sprinkled. Mr. Henry stated that he looked into it, and couldn't get a firm answer from anyone. He heard both less expensive and more expensive for fire sprinkler systems.

The Chair then called for a motion. Mr. Hemesath made a motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the language as proposed by staff. It was seconded by Ms. Mulhern.

The Chair then asked for discussion and re-affirmed that this was a minimum standard and that applicants could install a more robust fire sprinkler system. Staff concurred.

Mr. Henry then asked if there could be an Option for Applicants to refuse fire sprinklers given a fact that his clients are not supportive of an additional approximate cost of \$4,000. This idea was not supported.

Mr. Klumb proposed an idea to look at additional language referring to non-combustible building materials as an alternative to the fire sprinkler requirements. Staff agreed that this is an idea that should be pursued and taken to the Board in the future.

Mr. Henry reiterated that his objection was adding cost to homes in a down economy. But, he also agreed the proposed language was much better, and a move in the right direction. The Chair then called for the vote. While Mr. Henry abstained, all other votes were 'Aye' for sending the language forward to the Board with a recommendation of approval.

Motion: Motion to forward the proposed language to the Board with a recommendation of approval.

Action: Approve **Moved by:** Mr. Hemesath **Seconded by:** Ms. Mulhern

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 5, No = 0, Abstain = 1)

Yes: Chief Miller, Mr. Hemesath, Ms. Mulhern, Mr. Klumb, and Chair Rutherford. **No: 0**

Abstain: Mr. Henry

Item 3

Docket BC-13-03 (Shed Size Exemption): This is a proposed amendment to Section 105.2.1 of the adopted 2003 International Residential Code (IRC) and International Building Code (IBC) to change the actual square footage of one-story detached accessory structures from 120-square foot to 200-square foot and for exemption from the code requirements and the need to obtain a permit.

Ms. Wilson presented the docket, stating that this proposed change would relieve some cost to applicants in permitting fees, if the structure was 200-square foot or smaller and less than \$1,000.00 in cost. The Flood Plain Regulation would not be exempted from permit requirements if located in a flood plain.

Mr. Klumb asked how staff would know the cost of a permit. Staff answered that many times contracts are provided with costs for staff to use in determining cost.

There was general discussion about sheds in general, their multi-uses, and functions. Chair Rutherford stated that perhaps with rural opinion leaning towards no permits and no oversight, this could be a peace offering to relieve some of the regulatory burden.

Mr. Klumb asked if staff had a percentage of permits that would be affected. Staff did not think this would eliminate many permits.

Chief Miller made a motion that this docket be moved forward to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval. The motion was seconded by Mr. Klumb.

There was no further discussion. The Chair called for a vote, which was unanimous.

Motion: Motioned to forward this docket to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval. **Action:** Approve change from 120-square feet to 200-square feet for detached, one-story accessory structures for exemption from code requirements **Moved by:** Chief Miller **Seconded by:** Mr. Klumb

Vote: Motion passed unanimously (**Summary:** Yes = 6, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Chief Miller, Mr. Hemesath, Ms. Mulhern, Mr. Henry, Mr. Klumb, and Chair Rutherford.
No: 0 Abstain: 0

The Chair closed the meeting and requested that in the future he be allowed to recognize speakers for the record. Meeting was adjourned at 3:54 PM.

COCHISE COUNTY BUILDING CODE ADVISORY AND APPEALS BOARD

DRAFT MINUTES

Monday, July 7, 2014

Special Meeting at 3:00 p.m.

The special meeting of the Cochise County Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board, conducted via teleconference was called to order at 3:01 p.m. by Chairman Michael Rutherford at the Cochise County Complex, 1415 Melody Lane, Building G, Bisbee, Arizona in the Board of Supervisors' Executive Conference Room.

Planner Peter Gardner noted the following individuals were present: Michael Rutherford, Rutherford Diversified Industries; Ray Klumb, Architect; Bill Henry, Henry Design Build; James Olander, Electrician; Mike Hemesath, Civil Engineer; and Bill Miller, Chief, Fry Fire District. Staff members present included Peter Gardner, Planner I; Mike Izzo, Building Official; and Lee Sipe, Senior Inspector and Plans Examiner. Mr. Rutherford noted the absence of Kim Mulhern, Geologist. A quorum was present. Mr. Gardner noted that approval of the minutes from the previous meeting would be deferred until the next regular meeting with the permission of the Chair, which was granted. Chair Rutherford asked if there were any members of the public present. Mr. Gardner confirmed that there were not, and Mr. Rutherford introduced the first item on the agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

Item 1

Docket BC-14-01: Consideration of adoption of revisions to the existing Cochise County Building Safety Code Owner-Builder Amendment Options. The revisions are intended only to improve clarity and remove contradictory language.

Chairman Rutherford asked if the Board members had reviewed the docket and asked for questions. Mr. Klumb asked how Owner-Builders would know what the Building Codes are. Mr. Izzo stated that owner-builders might not know. Mr. Rutherford stated that without inspections they would likely not know and stated that the contractors were not happy with the program. Mr. Klumb asked for confirmation that no code inspections was an option. Mr. Gardner confirmed, noting that zoning inspections are still performed. Mr. Klumb asked how Staff enforced the requirement that the property not be sold after completion. Mr. Gardner explained that the program required a statement be recorded on the deed. Mr. Hemesath asked why the program was adopted in the first place. Mr. Gardner explained the compromise requiring this option be created to drive support for full code adoption. Mr. Hemesath asked about the impact on property values. Mr. Gardner explained Staff's effort to explain the impact of the program on lending for and insuring the property. Mr. Klumb asked how many such projects occur in an average year. Mr. Sipe guessed about a dozen homes total. Mr. Gardner stated that the number was closer to one or two dozen homes per year and several times that in accessory structures. Chair Rutherford asked Staff about the boundaries to use the program. Mr. Gardner explained the requirements, noting that most of the County by area qualified for the program. Mr. Rutherford asked about code compliance and work performed. Mr. Izzo explained that owners were required to follow the codes, but there was no mechanism to enforce the requirement under the program. Chief Miller asked if there was a distance outside city limits to use the program. Mr. Gardner explained that there was no such limit. Prior to the adoption of

code countywide, there were areas outside incorporated Sierra Vista and Benson that had code enforcement. Chief Miller then asked who would certify the code compliance of a home built under this program prior to sale. Mr. Gardner explained that the difficulty in doing so is what caused difficulties in lending. Chief Miller asked for clarification on how a lender would know the home was built under the program. Mr. Gardner explained that the form signed by the owners to use the program was recorded on the property and would show up on a title search. Mr. Olander stated that electric companies would not energize without an inspection from the County. Mr. Gardner stated that in his experience APS made it very difficult for the homeowners, but SSVEC would simply call Staff to confirm that the owner had indeed used the opt out amendment, and would then energize with the understanding that all risk was on the homeowner. He also noted that the utilities were free to decline to hook up with a visible unsafe condition. Mr. Klumb asked for the breakdown of the use of the limited inspection versus no inspection option. Mr. Gardner estimated the no inspection option was used at least 95-percent of the time. Mr. Hemesath asked how owners financed the building. Mr. Gardner explained that builders had cash in hand. He further noted that a local contractor building his own home under this program ran out of cash and had difficulty procuring financing. Mr. Sipe explained that the home was in a condition that inspections were still possible, and the owner came in and applied for a conventional permit, after which Staff conducted the regular inspections. Chair Rutherford asked for further comments. Mr. Klumb stated he "was not crazy about" the amendment, but felt the changes were an improvement. The other Board members agreed. Chair Rutherford asked for a motion. Chief Miller moved to forward the docket to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval. Mr. Henry seconded this motion. Chair Rutherford called for the vote on the motion, which passed unanimously.

Motion: Motioned to recommend that the changes made by Staff be adopted to the Owner-Builder Opt Out Amendment.

Action: Recommend the language changes made by Staff be adopted to the Owner-Builder Opt Out Amendment **Moved by:** Chief Miller **Seconded by:** Mr. Klumb

Vote: Motion passed (**Summary:** Yes = 6, No = 0, Abstain = 0)

Yes: Chairman Rutherford, Chief Miller, Mr. Hemesath, Mr. Olander, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Klumb.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the meeting. Meeting was adjourned at 3:16 PM.



COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs...Personal Service"

MEMORANDUM

TO: Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board (BCAAB)
FROM: Michael Izzo, Building Official
FOR: Beverly Wilson, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Docket BC-14-01 (Amendments to the Building Safety Code for Owner-Built Residential Dwellings and Accessory Structures)
DATE: August 18, 2014, for the September 9, 2014, BCAAB Meeting

I. NATURE OF REQUEST

Docket BC-14-01: This is a request to consider changes and clarifications to the *Amendment to the Cochise County Building Safety Code for Rural Residential Owner-Built Dwellings* (hereafter, "the Amendment").

II. BACKGROUND

In June of 2006, the Cochise County Board of Supervisors adopted the Amendment. The original purpose of the Amendment was to allow an eligible Owner-Builder to "opt out" of plan review, inspections, (or both) required under the Cochise County Building Safety Code. The original Amendment's intent was to allow "ingenuity and personal preferences of the Owner-Builder in allowing and facilitating the use of alternative building materials and methods", but was not intended to allow structures to be built that would not meet the minimum prescriptions of the Building Safety Code. In the years following the adoption of the Amendment, the use of alternative methods and materials has become more commonplace and there is common knowledge about how these structures perform with regard to building codes. Cochise County adopted the International Code Council's Performance Code when it adopted the Building Safety Code in 2006; this code allows materials and methods not detailed in the prescriptive code to be reviewed and inspected as usual providing documentation of their performance (through accepted engineering calculations, testing or computer modeling) is submitted to the Building Division.

A secondary, if not explicit, reason for the adoption of the Amendment was to provide relief from government oversight for Owner Builders in the rural areas of the County. In March of 2010, the Board amended the Rural Residential Owner-Built criteria by expanding the type of properties qualifying for the program. In this 2010 revision, the following statement was added: "Any construction work eligible for exemption for applicants applying under Option 2: *No Plan Review and No Inspections* shall not be subject to this permit expiration period." This statement is in direct conflict with the adopted Cochise County Zoning Regulations, and staff is proposing to remove it, to clarify for both the staff and the public.

III: CHANGES PROPOSED

1. Amend the Title of this document by adding "Accessory Structures" in addition to dwellings in heading to read: *Amendment to the Cochise County Building Safety Code for Rural Residential Owner-Built Dwellings and Accessory Structures*.
2. Added the words: "*Rural Residential*" in front of "Owner-Builder Amendment" throughout the document.
3. In the second paragraph of Section 1, edited the word "statewide codes" to read "*state and county building codes*" and deleted "*such as the plumbing, and state, county,*"
4. In Section 5, the first sentences of Option 1 and of Option 2 were both edited to clarify the intent and allow the sentence to be understood more easily. There were no new words added, the existing words were reordered for clarity.
5. In Section 8, the language referring to setbacks was eliminated, as the setbacks are defined by the Zoning Regulations. This language is proposed to be deleted: "*Setback information from the proposed structure to the property line in all directions shall be mandatory for consideration of eligibility for the Owner Builder Option.*"
6. In Section 12, the words "...*provided substantial progress has been made*" are being added.
7. Also in Section 12, the following language in direct conflict with the adopted Zoning Regulations is being deleted: "*Any construction work eligible for exemption for applicants applying under Option 2: No plan Review and No Inspections shall not be subject to this permit expiration period.*"
8. In Section 15, this sentence is being deleted to conform to actual practice of the Department: "*It shall be the duty of the Planning Department to notify or inform the applicant of the day during which the inspection is to be conducted.*" We have an 'Inspection Call-in' phone line dedicated to this purpose only. The recorded message clearly states that we will be out to do the inspection the following business day after the inspection is called in.
9. Section 20, 21, and 22, the following language is redundant and is being deleted: "*Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspection Option Only*)".
10. In Section 20, the words "*IRC Mechanical Code*" are inserted to clarify.
11. In Section 21, the words "*Electrical Codes*" are inserted to clarify.
12. In Section 22, the words "*IRC Plumbing Code*" are inserted to clarify.
13. In Section 23, the words "and Fire" are inserted to clarify.
14. In Section 24, the "*County Director of Environmental Health*" is deleted and "*Planning Department and the Cochise County Environmental Health Department Regulations*" is inserted, to reflect the changes in responsibility for environmental health regulations pertaining to residential sites.

IV: RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the BCAAB forward these proposed changes to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval.

Sample Motion: Mr. Chairman, I move to forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors for Docket R-14-07 as proposed.

V: ATTACHMENTS

A. Amendment to the Cochise County Building Safety Code for Rural Residential Owner-Built Dwellings and Accessory Structures (with proposed changes.)



COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs...Personal Service"

Amendment to the Cochise County Building Safety Code for **Rural Residential Owner-Built Rural Residential Dwellings and Accessory Structures:**

Section 1- Purpose and Intent.

The purpose of this amendment is to exempt a Rural Residential Owner-Builder from the requirement for construction plan review and inspections under the currently adopted version of the Cochise County Building Safety Code, provided the property is located in a Zoning District with a minimum parcel size of four ~~-(4)-~~ acres per dwelling unit and the subject parcel is at least four ~~-(4)-~~ acres in size. This option is available for *residential* construction projects only. This amendment also allows an **Rural Residential** Owner-Builder to ~~opt to~~ comply with the Cochise County Building Safety Code plan review but limit inspections. Such an Owner-Builder may, of course, also opt for compliance with the Cochise County Building Safety Code accompanied by full plan review and inspections. This amendment is intended to allow the **Rural Residential** ~~o~~Owner-~~b~~Builder the option to construct owner-occupied residential structures without County plan and inspection oversight, if the property is located in an area defined as "rural".

By statute, this exemption does not exempt owner-builders from state ~~wide, -county building~~ codes ~~such as the plumbing, and state, county,~~ or fire-district adopted fire codes and regulations regarding smoke detectors, nor does it exempt owner-builders from health regulations regarding wastewater treatment systems.

Section 2 - Application.

Rural – properties in any Zoning District with a maximum density of one dwelling unit per four acres or larger, as long as the subject parcel is of a size and configuration that conforms to the Zoning District in which it is located.

The provisions of this amendment shall apply to the erection, construction, enlargement, alteration, repair, moving, removal, demolition, conversion, occupancy and maintenance of limited density owner-built residential rural dwellings and accessory structures situated within the designated areas of Cochise County.

This amendment is limited to use by the owner-builder once in every five years for *Residential Dwellings* on all properties within the unincorporated area of Cochise County owned by that individual. This limitation does not apply to accessory structures or additions on the same property.

Section 3 - Definitions.

For the purpose of this amendment the following definitions shall apply:

A) Limited Density: Residential Rural Dwelling: Any site built residential structure consisting of one or more habitable rooms intended or designed to be occupied by one family with facilities for living and sleeping, with the use restricted to rural areas that fulfill the requirements of this amendment.

B) Owner-Builder: Owners of property who improve such property or who build or improve structures or appurtenances on such property and who do the work themselves, with their own employees or with duly licensed contractors, if the structure, group of structures or appurtenances, including the improvements thereto, are intended for occupancy solely by the owner and are not intended for occupancy by members of the public as the owner's employees or business visitors and the structures or appurtenances are not intended for sale or for rent.

C) Rural: For the purpose of this regulation only, "Rural" shall mean those unincorporated areas of the county eligible for the application of this regulation and as described in Section 2.

Section 4 - Regulation of Use.

A) For the purposes of this amendment, proof of the sale or rent or the offering for sale or rent of any such structure by the owner-builder within one year after completion or issuance of a certificate of occupancy is prima facie evidence that such project was undertaken for the purpose of sale or rent. As used in this paragraph "sale" or "rent" includes any arrangement by which the owner receives compensation in money, provisions, chattels or labor from the occupancy or transfer of the property or the structures on the property.

B) The *Owner-Builder* in selecting to use this amendment is strongly encouraged to take advantage of the best water conservation practices available at the time of construction (Note: county water conservation site development standards may be mandatory in some areas of the County). Additionally, if the property is located in the vicinity of a military airport the *Owner-Builder* is required to provide high noise sound attenuation through the construction materials selected for the project as defined and required by ARS § 28-8482B.

Section 5 - Amendment Options.

Option 1: Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections: ~~This option w~~When selected by the applicant during the permit issuance process, this option requires (in addition to Zoning and other County Departments inspection requirements) that only limited Building Code inspections dealing with the trade areas of Mechanical, Electrical, Plumbing and Fire Prevention be completed by County Building Inspectors. Full construction plan review and the required limited inspections for this option will be completed in accordance with the adopted *Cochise County Building Safety Code*.

Option 2: No Construction Plan Review with No Building Code Inspections ~~This option, w~~When selected by the applicant during the permit issuance process, this option requires (in addition to Zoning and other *County Departments* inspection requirements) that no building code inspections be completed by County Building Inspectors. In addition, by selecting this option, no construction plans are required to be submitted or reviewed by the *County Planning Department*.

Section 6 - Recording.

Each time a permit is issued pursuant to this amendment for residential dwellings, additions or accessory structures a notice that a permit has been issued pursuant to the provisions of this article shall be recorded with the County Recorder by the Planning Department.

Section 7 - Permits.

This amendment does not affect the requirement that prior to construction the Rural Residential Owner-Builder must obtain all permits required under State law and County ordinance.

Section 8 - Application Process.

To obtain a permit, the applicant shall first file an application with the Planning Department. Permit applications shall contain the following information:

- 1) Name and mailing address of the owner(s) of record;
- 2) Address and location of the proposed structures;
- 3) A general description of the proposed structure(s) or proposed work;
- 4) A site plan conforming to Section 1705 of the Cochise County Zoning Regulations; ~~Setback information from the proposed structure to the property lines in all directions shall be mandatory for consideration of eligibility for the Owner-Builder Option.~~
- 5) The signature of the owner of record or authorized agent;
- 6) The use or occupancy for which the work is intended;
- 7) Any other data or information as may be required by statute or regulation; and
- 8) A stipulation by the owner of record or authorized agent that the building or structure is to be constructed by the owner, or built for occupancy of the owner by licensed contractors with the owner-builder acting as the General Contractor;

9) The selection of the Rural Residential ~~e~~Owner-~~b~~Builder option of choice by the owner of record or authorized agent is contained in Section 5 of this amendment.

Section 9 - Construction Plans.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~s~~ Option-~~Only~~)

Two copies of Construction Plans (when applicable) for the proposed project shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval. These Construction Plans may be hand drawn by the applicant and may include a simplified diagram of the floor plan, structure elevations and construction details in order to determine the appropriate dimensions of structural members.

Section 10 - Waiver of Plans.

The Planning Department shall waive the submission of any plans if the department finds that the nature of the work applied for is such that the reviewing of plans is not necessary to obtain compliance with this amendment. The Planning Department shall waive the submission of construction plans when the regulation option of *No Construction Plan Review with No Building Code Inspections* ~~s~~ is selected at the time of permit application.

Section 11 - Modifications.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~s~~ Option-~~Only~~)

Modifications to the design, materials, and methods of construction are permitted, provided that the structural integrity of the building or structure is maintained, the building continues to conform to the provisions of this regulation, and the Planning Department is notified in writing of the intended modification and approves the modification prior to construction.

Section 12 - Permit Expiration.

Any building permit issued under this amendment shall be valid, without renewal, for a maximum period of ~~36--~~months for the Rural Residential Owner-Builder to show compliance with all County ~~z~~Zoning ~~r~~Regulations, setback requirements, and all state and local code requirements for which exemption does not apply as noted in Section 1-; however, the *County Zoning Inspector* may, upon written request of the permittee, extend the time limit for the permit once for an additional ~~12--~~months provided substantial progress has been made. ~~Any construction work eligible for exemption for applicants applying under Option 2: No Plan Review and No Inspections shall not be subject to this permit expiration period.~~

Section 13 - Inspections.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~s~~ Option-~~Only~~)

All construction or work for which a permit is required will be subject to inspection within the designated scope option of this amendment by the Planning Department. If an inspection is required, such construction or work shall remain accessible and exposed for inspection purposes until approved.

Approval as a result of an inspection shall not be construed to be an approval of a violation of the provisions of this code amendment or of other ordinances of the jurisdiction. Neither the building official nor the jurisdiction shall be liable for expense entailed in the removal or replacement of any material to allow inspection.

At anytime during the construction process for the *Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Inspections* option an applicant may elect to have an additional *Building Code* inspection completed (work being inspected must be accessible and exposed), in addition to the inspections already required under their selected option, at the adopted per hour inspection fee by a County Building Inspector.

Section 14 - Special Inspections.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~Option-Only~~)

Certain types of construction may require *Special Inspections*, when applicable, by Arizona Registered Design Professionals as required under Section 1704 of the adopted International Building Code and as determined by the Building Official.

Section 15 - Inspection Requests and Notice.

It shall be the duty of the applicant to notify the Planning Department that the construction is ready for inspection and to provide access to the premises when applicable. Inspections shall be requested by the applicant at least twenty-four (24) hours in advance of the intended inspection. ~~It shall be the duty of the Planning Department to notify or inform the applicant of the day during which the inspection is to be conducted.~~

Section 16 - Certificate of Occupancy.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~Option-Only~~)

After the dwelling(s) is completed for occupancy and any inspections which have been required by the Planning Department have been conducted and work approved, the Planning Department shall issue a conditioned Certificate of Occupancy for such dwelling(s) and accessory structure(s), which comply with the provisions of this amendment.

Section 17 - Temporary Occupancy.

(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspections ~~Option-Only~~)

The use and occupancy of a portion or portions of a dwelling or accessory structure prior to the completion of the entire structure shall be allowed, provided that approved sanitary facilities are available at the site and that the work completed does not create any condition to an extent that endangers life, health or safety of the public, visitors or occupants of the structure or portion thereof. Prior to any temporary occupancy of the dwelling or accessory structure a temporary occupancy inspection must be completed and approved by the Planning Department.

Section 18 - Fees.

Fees shall be required and collected by the Planning Department to provide for the cost of administering the provisions of this amendment as adopted by the Board of Supervisors. It is the intent of this amendment that permit processing and inspection fee schedules be established to reflect the actual inspection and administrative costs resulting from the application of the amendment.

Section 19 - General Requirements.

Each structure shall be built and maintained in a sound structural condition to be safe, sanitary, and to shelter the occupants from the elements.

Section 20 - Mechanical Requirements.

~~(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspection Option Only)~~

Fireplaces, cooling, heating, cooking appliances and gas piping installed in buildings constructed pursuant to this amendment shall be installed and vented in accordance with the requirements contained in the currently adopted *Cochise County Building Safety Code* (*IRC Mechanical Code*).

Section 21 - Electrical Requirements.

~~(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspection Option Only)~~

Where electrical wiring or appliances are installed, the installation shall be in accordance with the provisions contained in the currently adopted *Cochise County Building Safety Code* (*Electrical Codes*).

Exceptions: No dwelling or accessory structure constructed pursuant to this amendment shall be required to be connected to a source of electrical power, or wired, or otherwise fitted for electrification. In structures where electrical usage is confined to one or more rooms of a structure, the remainder of the structure shall not be required to be wired or otherwise fitted for electrification unless the Planning Department determines the electrical demands are expected to exceed the confinement and capacity of that room(s). It is the intent of this subsection to apply to buildings in which there exists a workshop, kitchen, or other single room, which may require electrification, and where there is no expectation of further electrical demand.

Section 22 - Plumbing Requirements.

~~(Full Construction Plan Review with Limited Building Code Inspection Option Only)~~

Plumbing equipment, systems and installation shall be in accordance with the requirements contained in the *Cochise County Building Safety Code* (IRC Plumbing Code) and the *Cochise County Health Department* regulations. Alternative materials and methods shall be permitted provided that the design complies with the intent of the *County* codes and regulations. Potable water shall be available to the dwelling site.

Section 23 - Fire Prevention Requirements.

Residential Smoke Detectors shall be provided in accordance with the requirements contained in the *Cochise County Building Safety* and Fire Code.

Section 24 - Sanitation Requirements.

Sanitation facilities, including the type, design, and number of facilities, as required and approved by the ~~*County Director of Environmental Health*~~Planning Department, and the Cochise County Environmental Health Department regulations, shall be provided to the dwelling site.

Section 25 - Violations.

The critical concern in the promulgation of this amendment is to provide for health and safety while maintaining respect for the law and voluntary compliance with the provisions of this amendment, and therefore, in the event that an order to correct a substandard condition (based on the level of option selected) is ignored, it is the intent of this section that the adopted *County Hearing Officer Rules of Procedure* for violations be followed.

Section 26 - Petitions for Appeals.

When applicable for a particular issue the adopted appeals process contained in the *Cochise County Zoning Regulations* or the *Cochise County Building Safety Code* shall be followed to hear and decide appeals dealing with issues on this amendment. The department shall keep a record of the decisions on appeals.

Section 27 - Rezoning and Change of Use.

If a structure(s) on a property has been built or altered under the relief granted by this amendment, this would be considered a factor against a rezoning to a higher density or a change of use if this action diminishes the parcel size to less than one dwelling unit per four acres. Any change of use from a residential dwelling to a

commercial use shall require certification by a registered design professional that the building complies with the currently adopted *Cochise County Building Code*.



COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs...Personal Service"

MEMORANDUM

TO: Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board
FROM: Michael D. Izzo, Building Official
FOR: Beverly Wilson, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Docket BC-14-02 (2012 Building Code Adoption)
DATE: August 29, 2014 for the September 9, 2014 Building Code Advisory Appeals Board

I. NATURE OF REQUEST

Docket BC-14-02: This is a request to consider the adoption of the 2012 International Code Council's published code series to reflect changes in industry process and technology to further protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. Cochise County first adopted the 2003 series of these codes, which are updated in three-year sequences. While much of America is looking toward the adoption of the 2015 codes, Staff is proposing that Cochise County consider updating to the 2012 series to be compatible with other jurisdictions around the state and within Cochise County itself. Sierra Vista and Benson adopted this code several years ago, which makes it difficult for the Contractors, Architects, and Engineers who are accustomed to the newer language to comply with the current code here in the County. Staff has been training on these changes, and with the arrival of Mr. Izzo, now has the expertise and professional experience to move this proposal forward.

These codes are in place to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of public and private property, to adopt certain rules and regulations controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, erection, installation, alteration, repair, location, relocation, replacement, addition to, use and maintenance of heating, cooling, ventilating, process piping, refrigerator systems, incinerator or other heat-producing appliance and to adopt certain rules and regulations to regulate the erection, construction, enlargement, alteration, repair, moving, removal, and demolition, conversion, occupancy, equipment, use, height, area and maintenance of all buildings, structures, or premises, the 2012 set of International Codes is meant to replace the 2003 series previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors. This family of codes has been supported by organizations such as the Arizona Building Officials, Inc., National Association of Homebuilders, Federal Emergency Management Agency and the American Institute of Architects.

II: BACKGROUND

Building Codes in Cochise County- A Short Chronology.

August 1984 Board of Supervisors adopted the Cochise County Comprehensive Plan, which included Land Use Activity Policy #7: "Urban improvement standards- including compliance with the Uniform Building Code in limited Growth Categories.

October 1985 Board of Supervisors adopted the Uniform Building Code as the Cochise County Building Safety Code, and applied it to the Category A Growth Areas immediately surrounding City of Sierra Vista.

- Exempted Category B and C Growth Areas

- Noted County's desire to adopt the building, plumbing, electrical or mechanical codes as adopted by the largest city in the County, Sierra Vista.

February 1986 Board of Supervisors expanded Category A Growth Area around the City of Sierra Vista.

September 1987 Board of Supervisors expanded the Building Safety Code Area to include those Category B Growth Areas surrounding Sierra Vista, Huachuca City and Benson.

November 1990 Board of Supervisors upgraded to the 1988 Uniform Building Code ("UBC") and related codes, and the 1990 National Electrical Code.

September 1995 Board of Supervisors upgraded from the 1988 UBC to the 1994 UBC also the 1994 Uniform Mechanical Code, Uniform Swimming Pool, Spa, and Hot Tub Code for those Growth Category A and B Areas surrounding Sierra Vista, Benson, and Huachuca City.

November 1996 Board of Supervisors deleted the Huachuca City and Whetstone areas from the UBC by designating Growth Category B Areas surrounding Bisbee, Douglas, Tombstone, Willcox, and land in Sunsites and St. David as rural for the purposes of ARS Section 11-861.

June 1997 Board of Supervisors adopted the 1996 National Electrical Code. Adoption of the 2000 International Building Codes with limited service and enforcement around areas mentioned above in September 1987 bullet.

December 14, 2004 Board of Supervisors approved Resolution 04-117, which adopted the 2003 version of the International Building Code, the International Residential Code, the International Mechanical Code, the International Energy Conservation Code, the International Existing Building Code, the International Fire Code, the International Fuel Gas Code, the International Electrical Code—Administrative Provisions, the Arizona State Plumbing Code, and the 2002 National Electrical Code and accompanying Building Code Fee Schedule; together these provisions constitute the Cochise County Building Safety Code.

December 9, 2008 By Resolution 08-129, the Board adopted a Residential Green Building Program (Docket R-08-05).

III: SUMMARY

Ever changing technologies and new developments in building design and construction practices show the need to keep pace with the industry. Allowing new practices and alternative designs better fulfills the needs of consumers and contractors. Due to continuing research and development in many areas, a relaxing of certain requirements fills a need in today's ever-

changing economy and consumer needs. The County desires to be more consistent with surrounding jurisdictions in their adoptions of the 2012 codes. The need has become apparent for an updating to the 2012 ICC codes.

III: RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the BCAAB forward a recommendation of approval of adopting those certain documents known as “International Building Code 2012; International Residential Code 2012; International Mechanical Code 2012; International Plumbing Code 2012; International Property Maintenance Code 2012; International Fuel Gas Code 2012; International Energy Conservation Code 2012, International Existing Building Code 2012, National Electrical Code 2011 and 2012 International Fire Codes to the Board of Supervisors, as amended (Attachment A).

IV. ATTACHMENTS

A. Attachment A – Proposed Amendments to the Code

BUILDING CODE

- [Introduction](#)
 - [Cochise County Building Safety Code](#)
-

Cochise County has adopted the Cochise County Building Safety Code. For single family and other applicable residences, the Building Code is ~~the 2003-~~ 2012 edition of the **International Residential Code** with the following climatic and geographic design criteria.

- Ground Snow Load:
 - under 5000 ft. = 0 p/sf
 - o over 5000 ft = 20 p/sf
- Wind Speed: 90 mph (3-second gust)
- Seismic Design Category: C
- Exposure: C
- Live Load: 20lb.
- Rainfall: 3" per hour
- Weathering:
 - up to 6000 ft = Negligible
 - o Over 6000 ft – Moderate
- Frost Line Depth:
 - under 5000 ft. = 0 in.
 - o Over 5000 ft. = 12 in.
- Termite: Very Heavy
- Decay: None to Slight
- Winter Design Temperature: 18 – 20 Degrees
- Flood Hazards: 12/4/84, 5/19/87, 4/17/89, 2/13/00, 2/15/00, and new panels as adopted by FEMA.

For other types of projects, the Building Safety Code consists of the 2003 2012 editions of the **International Building Code**, International Mechanical Code, International Energy Conservation Code, International Fire Code, International Fuel Gas Code, International Electrical Code, the 2005 2012 National Electrical Code (NFPA 70), and the 2006 2012 Edition of the International Plumbing Code.

Below is the list of amendments and appendices adopted as the Cochise County Building Safety Code

Cochise County Building Safety Code effective ~~4/14/06~~ 1/5/2015
Including Appendices and Amendments

International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition

Appendices

- B: Board of Appeals
- E: Supplementary Accessibility Requirements
- G: Flood Resistant Construction
- I: Patio Covers

Amendments to the International Building Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Building Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as 'this code'."
2. **At Section ~~101.4.5~~ 101.4.4**, delete the entire section.
3. **At Section 102.6**, change to read: "...the International Existing Building Code or the International Fire Code,"
4. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement Agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official.
5. **At Section 103.2**, delete entire section.
6. **At Section 103.3**, ~~delete entire section.~~ Remove the last sentence.
7. **At Section 105.2.7**, change to read: "Painting, papering, tiling, carpeting and similar finish work."
8. **At Section ~~108.3~~ 109.3 Building permit valuations (7-6-06)**, Change to read: The valuation of work for Complete Structures and Additions shall be determined from the County adopted *ICC Bi-Yearly Construction Costs Schedule* or the adopted *Residential One and Two Family Homes Valuation Rates*. If a project is covered under an adopted Flat Fee rate the value of the work is still required for reporting purposes.
 - For Remodeling, Tenant Fit-Ups and Phased Project work the applicant for a permit shall provide an estimated permit value at the time of application. Permit valuations shall include total value of work, including materials and labor, for which the permit is being issued, such as electrical, gas, mechanical, plumbing equipment and permanent systems. If, in the opinion of the building official, the valuation is underestimated on the application, the permit shall be denied, unless the applicant can show detailed estimates to meet the approval of the building official.
 - Final building permit valuation shall be set by the building official.
9. **~~At Section 109.3.7, "delete the entire section and renumber the remaining sections 109.3.7—109.3.9."~~**
At Section ~~310.4~~ 311.1, R-4, change to read: "Residential occupancies shall include buildings arranged for occupancy as Residential Care / Assisted Living

Facilities including more than six but not more than 16 occupants, excluding staff" (Amended per Resolution 04-19, Docket R-03-06).

10. **At Section ~~406.1.3~~, ~~406.3~~** change the first paragraph to read: "Carports of combustible construction and garages shall comply with the provisions of this section for separation and opening protection. Carport and garage floor surfaces shall be of approved noncombustible material."
11. **At Section ~~406.1.4~~(~~1~~ ~~406.3.4~~)**, change all references of 1/2"-inch gypsum board to 5/8"- inch gypsum board. At the end of this section, insert: "Doors providing opening protection shall be maintained tight-fitting, self-closing and self-latching. Windows are not permitted in the separation wall. All walls supporting the fire-resistance rated ceiling shall be protected with 5/8"-inch gypsum board."
12. **At Section ~~406.1.4~~(3)**, change to read: "Refer to Section 712 for protection of other through or membrane penetrations."
13. **At Section ~~406.1.4~~**, insert subsection 406.1.4(4): "Attic access opening. The attic access opening protection supports shall be of noncombustible material. Where a pull-down ladder is installed, it shall be a fire-rated ladder assembly."
14. **At Section ~~708.1~~(3)**, change to read: "Walls separating tenant spaces."
15. **At Section ~~717.4~~ ~~718.1~~**, change first sentence to read: "In construction designated as combustible construction by the design professional, fire blocking and draft stopping shall be installed in concealed locations in accordance with this section." (Continue the remainder of this paragraph).
16. **At Section ~~903.2.3~~(~~2~~ ~~903.2.4~~)**, change to read: "Where a Group F-1 fire area is located more than two stories above grade; or..."
17. **At Section ~~903.2.6~~(~~2~~ ~~903.2.7.2~~)**, change to read: "Where a Group M fire area is located more than two stories above grade; or...."
- 17-18. **Section 903.2.8.1 add "3,600 sq Ft" at the end of the sentence.**
- 18-19. **At Section ~~903.2.8~~(~~2~~~~903.2.9.2~~)**, change to read: "A Group S-1 fire area is located more than two stories above grade; or...."
- 19-20. **At Section ~~903.2.10.3~~ ~~903.2.11.3~~**, change to read: "Buildings more than two stories in height. An automatic sprinkler system shall be installed throughout every story of all buildings more than two stories or with a floor level having an occupant load of 30 or more." (The exceptions remain unchanged).
- 20-21. **At Section 1011.1**, Revise by adding the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph: "Floor level exit signs, when exit signs are required, additional approved low-level exit signs which are internally or externally or self-illuminated shall be provided in all interior corridors serving guest rooms of hotels in Group R-1 occupancies."
- 21-22. **At Section ~~1011.5.3~~, delete the exception Deleted in the 2012.**
- 22-23. **At Section ~~1805.2~~ ~~1807.1~~ and ~~1809.1~~**, Change the first sentence to read as follows: "The minimum depth of footings below the undisturbed ground surface shall be 12 inches for 1000 p/sf allowable foundation pressure and minimum 18 inches for values of Table ~~1804.2~~~~1806.2~~."
23. **At Section 2111.3**, change to read: "In Seismic Design Category C and D, masonry and concrete fireplaces shall...." and "In Seismic Design Category A and B, reinforcement and seismic anchorage is not required." (Requires reinforcement of masonry fireplaces and chimneys in moderate seismic zones).

24. **At Section 2111.4**, insert "C" after Seismic Design Category. (Requires seismic anchorage of masonry fireplaces in moderate seismic zones).
25. **At Section 2902.6**, insert subsection 2902.6.4 to read: "In existing buildings, one public / employee restroom is permitted where the occupant load does not exceed 50." (Reduces restroom requirements for small existing buildings).
26. **At Section 3109**, delete the entire section and insert, in lieu thereof, "the International Residential Code, 2003 edition, Appendix G, as amended shall apply."

International Residential Code, **2003-2012** edition:

Appendices:

- A: Sizing and Capacities of Gas Piping
- B: Sizing of Venting Systems Serving Appliances Equipped with Draft Hoods, Category I appliances and Appliances Listed for Use and Type B Vents.
- C: Exit Terminals of Mechanical Draft and Direct-Vent Venting Systems
- D: Recommended Procedure or Safety Inspection of an Existing Appliance Installation
- G: Swimming Pools, Spas and Hot Tubs
- H: Patio Covers
- J: Existing Building and Structures
- K: Sound Transmissions

Amendments to the International Residential Code

1. **At Section R101.1 Title**, change to read: "These provisions shall be known as the Residential Code for One and Two-Family Dwellings of the County of Cochise, and shall be cited as such and will be referred to herein as 'this code'."
2. **At Section R103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official."

~~3. **At Section R103.2**, delete the entire section~~

~~4.3. **At Section R103.3**, delete the entire section.~~

~~5.4. **At Section R105.2.1**, change to read: "...120 square feet."~~ ['12 Reads 200](#)

[Sq Ft](#)

- 6.5. **Add - New Section R105.2.3 Ordinary Repairs (7-6-06):** Ordinary repairs which involve only the replacement of component parts of existing work with similar parts or materials and don't exceed \$1000.00 in valuation (materials and labor at market value), and do not change any structural, electrical, mechanical, plumbing or fire safety condition.
 - A "component part" is a portion of an assembly and not a complete rework or replacement of the total assembly (e.g., an existing door or water heater replaced with a new unit and a repair or replacement of individual roof shingles but not an entire re-roof). Ordinary repairs need to abide by the limitations contained in 'Section R105.2.2 Repairs' of this

code.

- 7.6. ~~At Section R105.2.6, change to read: "Painting, papering, tiling, carpeting and similar finish work."~~ ^{'12 adds cabinets and countertops}

- 8.7. **At Section R-108.3 Building Permit valuation 76-06** Change to read:

The valuation of work for Complete Structures and Additions shall be determined from the County adopted *ICC Bi-Yearly Construction Costs Schedule* or the adopted *Residential One and Two Family Homes Valuation Rates*. If a project is covered under an adopted Flat Fee rate the value of the work is still required for reporting purposes.

- o For Remodeling, Tenant Fit-Ups and Phased Project work the applicant for a permit shall provide an estimated permit value at the time of application. Permit valuations shall include total value of work, including materials and labor, for which the permit is being issued, such as electrical, gas, mechanical, plumbing equipment and permanent systems. If, in the opinion of the building official, the valuation is underestimated on the application, the permit shall be denied, unless the applicant can show detailed estimates to meet the approval of the building official. Final building permit valuation shall be set by the building official.

- 9.8. **At Table R301.2(1), insert the following data:**

- o Ground snow load

- Under 5500 ft. 0 p/sf.
- Above 5500 ft. 20 p/sf.

- o Wind Speed 90 mph (3 - second gust)
- o Seismic Design Category C
- o Exposure C
- o Live Load 20 lb.
- o Rainfall 3" per hour
- o Weathering Negligible

- Above 6000 ft. Moderate

- o Frost Line Depth

- Under 5500 ft. 0 in.
- Above 5500 ft. 12 in.
- Termite Very Heavy

9.

- o Decay None to Slight
- o Winter Design Temperature 18 – 20 Degrees
- o Flood Hazards 12/4/84, 5/19/87, 4/17/89, 2/13/00, 2/14/00, 2/15/00, and new panels as adopted by FEMA

10. ~~At Section R309, insert the words "or carport of combustible construction", after all references to garage. (Requires fire separation from carport).~~ ^{'12 defines}

[carports, I think this is unnecessary.](#)

At Section ~~R309.1~~R302.5.1, insert at the end of section: "Doors providing opening protection shall be maintained self-closing and self-latching."

(Amendments 4 and 5 require a one-hour fire protective separation between a house and attached garage; IRC does not require self-closing and self-latching doors, and requires ½ inch gypsum board only)

11. **At Section ~~R309.2~~, R302.6** change the two references of "1 / 2-inch gypsum board" to "5 / 8-inch Type X gypsum board".
12. **At Section R309.2**, insert subsection "R309.2.1 Attic access opening. The attic access opening protection supports shall be of noncombustible material." Where a pull-down ladder is installed, it shall be a fire-rated ladder assembly.
13. **At Section ~~R311.2.2~~ R302.6**, change the reference of "1/2 – inch gypsum board" to "5/8 – inch Type X gypsum board."
14. **At Section ~~R313.2~~ R314**, insert the following after the second sentence: "Smoke alarms shall not be installed on a dedicated circuit and shall originate from a general-purpose branch circuit."
15. **At Section R321**, change to read: "~~...to be plainly visible and legible, in contrasting colors, from the street...~~" [Already addressed in '12](#)
16. **At Section R403.1.3**, insert "C" after Seismic Design Categories. (4 locations) **At Section ~~R403.1.3.2~~**, delete the exception.
17. **At Section R404.1.4**, Insert "C" after Seismic Design Categories. (4 locations)
18. **At Section ~~R602.10.1~~**, second paragraph, change to read: "~~...if the bracing begins more than 12.5 feet from each end.~~" (Changes from 12 feet). [Totally Changed](#)
19. **At Section R606.10**, change to read: "Masonry walls shall be reinforced and anchored."
20. **At Figure R606.10 (2)**, change the following: change #4 bars at 10 ft. o.c. to 4 ft. o.c.; add one 1/2" bar @ top of foundation; add two 1/2" bars @ bottom of foundation; add one 1/2" bar @ top of wall; add one 1/2" bar @ roof connection. [This section deleted](#)
21. **At Section ~~R606.11.2.2.3~~, R606.12.2.3.3** end of the first paragraph, change to read: "...and at a maximum spacing of 4 feet." (Changes rebar requirement from 10 foot spacing). [Still 10 feet in '12](#)
22. **At Section R1003.3**, insert "C" ~~after~~ [into](#) Seismic Design Categories.
23. **At Section R1003.4**, insert "C" after Seismic Design Categories.
24. **At Chapter 11-** Suspend the IECC Chapter 11 from the 2012 IRC and revert to the provisions of the Chapter 11 IECC in the 2003 IRC. Where any referenced code section conflicts with this amendment, the Building Official shall have authority to make determinations, at such time, for code compliance.
25. **At Section P2603.6.4.5.1**, revise the paragraph to read: "Sewer depth regardless of freezing conditions, all building sewers that connect to private or public systems shall be a minimum of 12 inches below grade."
26. **At Section ~~P3201.2~~ exception**, change to read: "Exception: Traps for floor drains shall be fitted with a trap primer." [Eliminates "Deep Seal Design" '12 Allows for Trap primer or Deep Seal Design\)](#)
27. **At Section ~~E3504~~3601**, amend by adding: Section ~~E3504~~3601.8. Recessed

Service Entry. A recessed service entry is not permitted.

28. **At Section ~~E3504~~E3601.6.2**, amend by adding the following at the end of the first paragraph: "Service disconnecting means and risers shall be surface mounted."
29. **At Section ~~E3504~~3601.6.2**, amend by changing the first sentence to read: "The service disconnecting means shall be permanently installed on the outside of the structure."
30. **At Section ~~E3502.4~~ 3602.1**, amend the second sentence to read: "For one-family dwellings, the rating of the ungrounded conductor shall be not less than 200 amperes, 3-wire. Exception: Existing structures."
31. **At Section ~~E3507.3.2~~, delete this section. E3607.3.1**
32. **At Section ~~E35608.1~~**, insert a second paragraph: "All accessory structures with a poured foundation require the installation of a concrete-encased electrode as required by Section ~~E35608.1.2~~."

33. At Section ~~E3801.2.2~~ subparagraph 1, delete the word "fireplaces."

34. At Section ~~E3801.4.5~~, third sentence, change to read: "Receptacle outlets rendered not readily accessible by appliances or appliance garages fastened in place, or appliances or appliance garages occupying dedicated space, shall not be considered as these required outlets." is now in the code E3901.4.5

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Font: Bold

35. **33. At Section ~~E3804~~ 901.10**, insert after the first sentence: "Hallways and foyers 5 feet or greater in width shall have receptacle spacing as required by Section ~~E3801.2~~." **3901.2**
36. **34. At Section ~~E3802~~, amend by adding new section: E3802.9 Arc-Fault Circuit Interrupter Protection. E3802.9.1 Definition. An arc-fault circuit interrupter is a device intended to provide protection from the effects of arc faults by recognizing characteristics unique to arcing and by functioning to de-energize the circuit when an arc fault is detected. E3802.9.2 Dwelling Unit Sleeping Rooms. All branch circuits that supply 125-volt, single-phase, 15- and 20-ampere outlets installed in dwelling unit sleeping rooms shall be protected by an arc-fault circuit interrupter listed to provide protection of the entire branch circuit. Required everywhere in "12 3902.12**
37. **35. At Section ~~E3802.5~~, amend the first paragraph to read: "All 125-volt, single-phase, 15- and 20-ampere receptacles installed in ground-level rooms and unfinished basements shall have ground-fault circuit interrupter protection for personnel. For purposes of this section, ground-level rooms and unfinished basements are defined as areas not intended as habitable rooms and limited to storage areas, work areas and the like. (The exceptions shall remain unchanged.)" Already changed in "12 3902.5**
38. **36. At Section ~~E3903.11~~, amend the title to read: "Luminaries (Fixtures) in Clothes Closets, Pantries, and Storage Rooms. (All reference in this section to closet or clothes closet shall apply to clothes closets, pantries, and storage rooms.)" Just defines closet. Now E4003.12**
39. **37. At Section ~~E3903~~, 4903 amend by adding a new section: Section ~~E3903.11.1~~ 4903.14 Transformers. Doorbell transformers shall not be permitted**

in a closet, pantry or storage room. If a receptacle is installed for an alarm system Transformer, it shall be located above the door.

- 40.38. ~~At Section AG105.2.1~~, change to read: "The top of the barrier shall be at least 60 inches above grade...."

International Mechanical Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition:

Appendices:

- A: Combustion Air Openings and Chimney Connector Pass-Through

Amendments to the International Mechanical Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Mechanical Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as "this code."
2. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement Agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official."
3. ~~At Section 103.2, delete entire section.~~
4. ~~At Section 103.3, delete entire section.~~
- 5.3. ~~At Section 106.5.2~~, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition, Section 108.2, as amended.
- 6.4. ~~At Section 106.5.3~~, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition, Section 108.2, as amended.

International Energy Conservation Code, ~~2003~~ edition: 2012

Appendices:

- Sections and Construction Details

Amendments to the International Energy Conservation Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Energy Conservation Code of the County of Cochise, and shall be cited as such. It is referred to herein as 'this code'."
2. ~~At Section 105, delete the entire section.~~

International Existing Building Code, ~~2003~~ edition: 2012

Appendices:

- A: Seismic Strengthening Provisions for Un-reinforced Masonry Bearing Wall Buildings.
- B: Supplementary Accessibility Requirements for Existing Buildings and Facilities.

Amendments to the International Existing Building Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Existing Building Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as 'this code'."
2. **At Section 101.4.2**, delete reference to International Property Maintenance code.
3. **At Section ~~101.5~~ 301.2**, delete reference to International Property Maintenance code.
4. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement Agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge here of shall be known as the Building Official."
5. **At Section 103.2**, delete entire section.
6. **~~At Section 103.3, delete entire section.~~**
7. **~~6. At Section 105.2.2, change to read: "Painting, papering, tiling, carpeting and similar finish work."~~**
8. **7. At Section ~~1401.2~~ 1301.2**, delete reference to International Property Maintenance code.
9. **8. At Section ~~1201.3.2~~ 1401.3.2**, delete reference to International Property Maintenance code.

International Fire Code, 2003 edition:

Appendices:

- B: Fire-Flow requirements for Buildings
- D: Fire Apparatus Access Roads
- E: Hazard Categories
- F: Hazard Ranking
- G: Cryogenic Fluids – Weight and Volume Equivalents

Amendments to the International Fire Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Fire Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as 'this code'."
2. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement Agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official. Any code reference to Fire Code Official shall be replaced by Building Official."

3. ~~At Section 103.2, delete entire section.~~

4. ~~At Section 103.3, delete entire section.~~

5.4. ~~At Section 503.1.1~~, change to read: "Approved fire apparatus access roads (lanes) shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of this section and shall extend to within 150 feet (45.75 m) of all portions of the facility. Buildings exceeding 30 feet (9.14 m) in height and set back more than 50 feet (15.25 m) from a common access way shall also require an approved fire access road. The marking of fire access roads on private property, devoted to public use, shall be approved by the code official and police department. Exception: Where buildings are protected throughout with an approved Automatic sprinkler system, the provisions of this section shall be permitted to be modified by the code official."

6.5. ~~At Section 503.3~~, change to read: "Fire lanes shall be marked with free standing signs or marked curbs, sidewalks, or other traffic surfaces that have the words 'Fire Lane – No Parking' painted in contrasting colors at a size and spacing approved by the authority having jurisdiction."

International Fuel Gas Code, 2003 edition: 2012

Appendices:

- A: Sizing and Capacities of Gas Piping
- B: Sizing of Venting Systems Serving Appliances Equipped with Draft Hoods, Category I Appliances, and Appliances Listed for Use with Type B Vents.
- C: Exit Terminals of Mechanical Draft and Direct-Vent Venting Systems
- D: Recommended Procedure for Safety Inspection of an Existing Appliance Installation.

Amendments to the International Fuel Gas Code

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as the Fuel Gas Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as 'this code'."
2. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: "Enforcement agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official."

3. ~~At Section 103.2, delete entire section.~~

4.3. ~~At Section 103.3, delete entire section.~~

5.4. ~~At Section 106.5.2 106.6.2~~, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, 2003- 2012 edition, Section 108.2, as amended.

6.5. ~~At Section 106.5.3 106.6.3~~, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, 2003- 2012 edition, Section 108.2, as amended. Refunds

7.6. ~~At Section 303.7~~, insert Subsection 303.7.1 to read: "Liquefied petroleum

gas piping shall not serve any gas appliance located in a pit or basement where heavier-than-air gas might collect to form a flammable mixture."

International Electrical Code – Administrative Provisions, 2003 edition:

Appendices:

- None

Amendments to the International Electrical Code – Administrative Provisions

1. **At Section 101.1 Title**, change to read: "These regulations shall be known as The Electrical Code-Administrative Provisions of the County of Cochise and Shall be cited as such and will be referred to herein as 'this code'."
2. **At Section 201.3**, delete reference to the International Private Sewage Disposal Code, International Property Maintenance Code and the International Zoning Code.
3. **At Section 301.1**, change to read: Enforcement agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official.
4. **At Section 301.2**, delete entire section.
5. ~~**At Section 301.3**, delete entire section.~~
6. **At Section 404.2**, delete the entire section and insert, in lieu thereof, the International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition, Section 108.2, as amended.

NFPA 70 - National Electrical Code, 2005 edition: 2011

Appendices:

- None

Amendments to the National Electrical Code-~~2005~~ 2011 Edition

1. **At Article 210.8(A)(5)**, Amend the first paragraph to read: "All 125-volt, single phase, 15- and 20-ampere receptacles installed in ground level rooms and unfinished basements shall have ground-fault circuit-interrupter protection for personnel. For purposes of this section, ground level rooms and unfinished basements are defined as areas not intended as habitable rooms and limited to storage areas, work areas, and the like. (The exceptions shall remain unchanged.)"
2. **At Article 210-8(B)(3)** – amend to read: "Roof tops. The receptacle(s) shall have the reset located on the roof."
3. ~~**At Article 210.52 (A)(2)(1)**, amend by deleting the word "fireplaces".~~
- 4.3. **At Article 210.52 (H)**, amend by adding the following at the end of the first sentence: "Hallways and foyers 5 feet or greater in width shall have receptacle spacing as required by Article 210-52 (A)."

6-4. **At Article 210**, amend by adding: "Article 210.64 Commercial Buildings. At least one 125-volt, single phase, 15- or 20- ampere-rated receptacle outlet shall be provided at the locations specified below."

1. Outdoors, near the front and rear entrances, accessible at grade level. Article 210-8 (B) shall apply.
2. In all restrooms, adjacent to and within 3 feet of the outside edge of one basin. Article 210.8 (B) shall apply.

6-5. **At Article 210.70**, amend by adding "Article 210.71 Smoke Alarms. Where required, smoke alarms shall not be installed on a dedicated circuit and shall originate from a general-purpose branch circuit."

7-6. **At Article 215.2 (A)(1)**, amend by adding the following before the first sentence: "Ungrounded feeder conductors shall have an ampacity of the highest rating of the equipment."

8-7. **At Article 230.70(A)(1)**, amend the first paragraph to read: "The service disconnecting means shall be installed at a readily accessible location outside the building or structure. Exception: The service disconnecting means may be installed inside the building when a remote means of disconnecting the service is provided from outside of the building."

9-8. **At Article 230.70(A)(1)**, amend by adding a second paragraph to read: "For one family dwelling, except mobile and manufactured homes, the service disconnecting means shall be permanently installed on the outside of the structure."

40-9. **At Article 230.79(C)**, amend to read: "For a one-family dwelling, the service disconnecting means shall have a rating of not less than 200 amperes, 3 wire. Exception: Existing structures."

11-10. **At Article 230.90 (A)**, amend by adding the following before the first sentence: "The ungrounded conductor shall have an ampacity of the highest rating(s) of the service equipment."

12-11. **At Article 250.32 (B)(2)**, delete entire paragraph.

13-12. **At Article 250.50**, amend by adding a second paragraph to read: "All accessory structures with a poured foundation require the installation of a concrete-encased electrode as required by Article 250.52 (A)(3)."

14-13. **At Article 300.1**, amend by adding: "Article 300.1(D). Special Requirements. The following requirements shall apply to all work except R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4 occupancies (as defined in the International Building Code) and U and S occupancies accessory to R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4 (including feeders and home runs serving these excepted occupancies).

1. All wiring shall be installed in Rigid, IMC, EMT, PVC (below top of slab), MC, AC or steel flexible metal conduit, as permitted by this code.
2. Existing energized wiring may remain if it was lawfully installed to code.
3. Changes to an existing circuit require any wiring method listed in (a) above with installation back to panel.
4. Conductors shall not be smaller than No. 12 copper or equivalent. Control circuits shall be per load requirements.
5. Unused conduit, conductors, and cables located above accessible ceilings and in accessible walls shall be removed.

15.14. **At Article 300.21**, amend by adding paragraphs 2 and 3 to read:

"Penetrations of one-hour fire-resistive rated walls shall require approved metallic raceway with 12-inch extensions on both sides of the wall. The penetrations of the wall and conduit ends shall be firesafed." And "Penetrations of two-hour, or greater, fire-resistance rated walls shall require approved metallic raceway with 5-foot extensions on both sides of the wall. The penetrations of the wall and the conduit ends shall be firesafed."

16.15. **At Article 334.12 (A)**, amend by adding item (11) to read: "(11) In other structures as specified in Article 300.1(D)."

17.16. **At Article 406**, amend by adding: "Article 406.3 (A)(1) Installation. When installed in a vertical position, grounding-type receptacles shall be installed with the grounding contacts down. When installed in the horizontal position, grounding-type receptacles shall be installed with the grounding contacts on the right."

18.17. **At Article 408**, amend by adding: "Article 408.31 Sub-panels and Low-voltage Boxes. Sub-panels and low-voltage boxes shall not be located in any firewall, fire barrier, fire partition, or in the garage side of the common wall separating the dwelling from a garage or carport. Sub-panels and low-voltage boxes may be surface mounted on any of the above mentioned walls."

19.18. **At Article ~~410.8~~ 410.16**, amend the title to read: "Luminaries (Fixtures) in Clothes Closets, Pantries and Storage Rooms. (All references in this article and section to closet or clothes closet shall apply to clothes closets, pantries and storage rooms.)"

20.19. **At Article ~~410.15~~ 410.30(B)(3)**, amend the first paragraph to read: "A metal pole shall be provided with a grounding terminal. All metal poles supporting lighting fixtures shall have a 20 foot coil of #4 copper installed at the base of the footing and extended to a separate termination point on the pole."

21.20. **At Article ~~450.13~~, 450.13C** amend by adding paragraph (C) to read: "Doorbell transformers shall not be permitted in a closet, pantry or storage room. If a receptacle is installed for an alarm system transformer, it shall be located above the door."

22.21. **At Article 720.11**, amend to read: "Circuits operating at less than 50 volts shall be installed in a neat and workmanlike manner. Cables shall be supported by the building structure, independently of suspended ceiling wires every 6 feet. Cables shall be installed parallel or perpendicular to the building framing."

International Plumbing Code: ~~2006~~ 2012 Editions.

Appendices:

- B: Rates of Rainfall for Various Cities
- C: Gray Water Recycling Systems
- E: Sizing of Water Piping System

Amendments to the International Plumbing Code 2006 Edition

The following provisions of the International Plumbing Code, 2006 edition, as published by the International Code Council, Inc., are hereby amended as follows:

1. **At Section 101.1**, change to read: These regulations shall be known as the Plumbing Code of the County of Cochise, hereinafter referred to as "this code."
2. **At Section 101.2**, number the existing exception as Exception 1; insert Exception 2 to read: Plumbing systems in existing buildings undergoing repair, alteration, or additions, and change of occupancy shall be permitted to comply with the International Existing Building Code.
3. **At Section 103.1**, change to read: Enforcement agency. There exists a Building Code Division under the Cochise County Planning Department and the official in charge thereof shall be known as the Building Official.
4. **At Section 103.3**, delete the entire section and renumber the remaining section 103.3.
5. **At Section 106.6.2**, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition, Section 108.3, as amended.
6. **At Section 106.6.3**, delete the entire section and insert in lieu thereof the International Building Code, ~~2003~~ 2012 edition, Section 108.3, as amended.
7. **At Section 301.3**, insert at the end of this section: Exception: Bathtubs, showers, lavatories, clothes washers and laundry trays shall not be required to discharge to the sanitary drainage system where such fixtures discharge to an approved gray water system for flushing of water closets and urinals or for subsurface landscape irrigation.
8. **At Section ~~904.4~~ 903.1**, insert in the [number], 6"
9. **At Section 1003.1**, insert at the end of this section: A grease interceptor is required if a food establishment that produces grease in their wastewater is served by a septic system.
10. **At Section 1003.3.4.1** insert at the end of this section: Grease interceptors may be designed for size in accordance with the Arizona Administrative Code.
11. **At Section 1003.4.2.1** insert at the end of this section: Oil interceptors may be designed for size in accordance with the Arizona Administrative Code.
12. Specifically adopt Appendices B [3" per hour], C, and E.



COCHISE COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs...Personal Service"

MEMORANDUM

TO: Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board
FROM: Michael D. Izzo, Building Official
FOR: Beverly Wilson, Planning Director
SUBJECT: Docket BC-14-03 (Update Fee Schedule)
DATE: August 29, 2014 for the September 9, 2014 BCAAB Meeting

I: NATURE OF REQUEST

Docket BC-14-03 (Update Fee Schedule) is a proposal to update the current Planning, Zoning, and Building Safety fee schedule to reflect 'real cost' of the department in travel and manpower. The current Fee Schedule was last approved by the Board of Supervisors (BOS) in 2004.

II: BACKGROUND

In early 2013, the Board of Supervisors directed staff to combine the existing three fee schedules into a format that could be easily referenced by the Public. The three schedules were Planning, Zoning, and the Building Code fees. Shortly thereafter, the Building Official resigned, which left a vacancy in the Department until Mr. Izzo began his career at the County earlier this year. Staff was directed to await a new Building Official to proceed with this task, which has now been completed.

During the process of combining the fee schedules, Staff looked at the 'real cost' in employment costs and vehicle costs to perform the review of paperwork and to physically inspect building projects. A survey of surrounding Jurisdictions shows that Cochise County has a very low fee rate. For example, both Benson and Bisbee are currently charging 65% of the building code fee to perform a plan review, while we remain at 25%. The prescriptive construction cost per square foot for a single-family residence is up to \$110.29/square foot in Sierra Vista, while Cochise County uses \$52.00/square foot. The current fee schedule has failed to keep up with inflation not only in the building code area, but also in the equipment costs of vehicles and office machinery.

The fee schedule also covers processes performed by the Department under Delegation Agreements with other agencies, such as the State of Arizona Office of Manufactured Homes. The existing fee schedule falls well below their threshold and staff is recommending that we adopt the State fee schedule. With this in mind, here are some of the major proposed changes:

Format: The previous fee schedules have been combined into a single document with an index for easy reference. The fees have been divided into categories such as 'Zoning' and 'Subdivisions'. Staff is confident that the Public will find the new format simpler to use.

Section 1 – Administration: These fees are mainly for document copies, and have not been

raised. Oversized documents have been added, to reflect the commercial rates of these copies.

Section 2 – Environmental Health: The Planning Division assumed the inspection responsibilities for sanitary sewer systems in late 2012. The fees shown in this section were approved for the Health Department by the Board. No changes are proposed to these fees.

Section 3 - Floodplain: The Planning Division of Community Development collects fees for floodplain use permits as we use a Joint Permit Application process to streamline the permitting process for applicants. No changes are proposed to these fees.

Section 4 – Highway: The Right-of-Way fee is similar to the floodplain fee above. The Planning Division collects this fee for the Highway Division to expedite the application process.

Section 5 – Miscellaneous: The 'Trade' permits can be either Residential or Non-Residential and usually involve replacement of mechanical, plumbing, or electrical systems. Other items such as swimming pools and solar systems are also shown in this section. The requirement for permitting is also clearly spelled out in this section. For instance, if my electric hot water heater should fail and I choose to replace it with a new electric one, a permit is not required. Staff is recommending that some of the fees in this section be increased to more accurately reflect staff time and vehicular use to review, issue, and inspect these items.

Section 6 – Office of Manufactured Housing (OMH): These fees come from the schedule set by the State of Arizona for those Counties that work under a Delegation Agreement for the OMH. They are substantially higher than the current fees charged by the Planning Division.

Section 7 – Planning: The planning fees are not proposed to change, however, staff has long felt that the time and effort expended in researching, required notifications to neighbors, and issuing of a Home Occupation permit warranted a minimal fee, at the least. Research of other Counties shows that the ranges of fees for these types of permits are widely varied. Staff is recommending that a \$75.00 fee be added to the schedule, which will cover Staff time and the cost of required postage.

Section 8 – Rural Residential Owner/Builder Fees: The fees shown in this section have been adjusted to cover the amount of staff time spent on plan review and minimal inspections. A single-family dwelling that is submitted for full plan review and inspection has a charge based on valuation and plan review. This current fee of \$325 plus plan review is significantly lower, comparatively speaking, as it would cover a home valued under \$26,000, which is an unreasonable determination of any residence being constructed today. The \$700 fee proposed by staff would cover a home valued under \$100,000.00 and is more realistic in today's market. Staff is recommending that the 'no inspection/no plan review option also be raised.

Section 9 – Subdivisions: There are no changes in fees proposed in this section, however, language is added to clarify current practice of collecting fees for floodplain and drainage review, and waivers requested.

Section 10 – Zoning: Staff is recommending that many of these fees be raised to adequately cover staffing costs. Review time for all permits involves tracking down historical data, including previously existing sanitary sewer systems. These files can be difficult to trace, as staff is still working towards electronic availability of all parcel files. Many times a simple revision to a permit involves plan review for code compliance; \$15 does not begin to cover this cost in Staffing.

A new fee has been added for digital signs in this section. As recently discovered, calculations to establish lumens, nits, and color correlation for code compliance is no easy task. These are engineer scale calculations, and involve much more research and work by staff to ensure compliance with adopted codes.

Section 11 – Residential Building Code Fees and Section 12 – Non-Residential Building Code Fees: These two sections have never been included in the Planning Division Fee Schedule, due in part to the multi-step process that staff undertakes to calculate them. Staff has made an effort with these two sections to simplify them for the use of the public. The Residential Building Code Fee is set by policy of the BOS; however, staff has researched surrounding Jurisdictions and other Counties in Arizona to provide a framework of reference. These fees are shown in the attachment to this memo – and are a bit startling. Cochise County has held down these fees since the adoption of the Building Safety Code in late 2004. Staff is recommending an increase in the square-foot fee as well as the percentage of that fee charged for plan review.

The Non-Residential fees are updated semi-annually by the ICC – and used by Staff. The use of this update was approved by the Ordinance adopting these codes.

III: SUMMARY

Staff is proposing an update to the Planning Division Fee Schedule to include charges for Zoning, Building Safety, and Planning. The proposed update is not merely a request to increase fees; it is a compilation of three fee schedules that have not been presented by Cochise County as a single document, to date. It is Staff's intent to better serve the County by presenting this easily read and understood format.

IV: RECOMMENDATION

Staff is requesting that the Building Code Advisory and Appeals Board forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors to amend the current Planning and Zoning Fee Schedule as shown in Attachment A.

V. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Updated Fee Schedule
- B. Fees of other Jurisdictions and Counties



COCHISE COUNTY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

"Public Programs... Personal Service"

Planning & Zoning Fee Division Fee Schedule

This Planning and Zoning Fee Division Fee Schedule contains the Cochise County Community Development County adopted Planning, and Zoning, and Building Safety fees as follow, the fees related to the State of Arizona Manufactured Home and Factory-Built Buildings programs, the County's Rehabilitated Mobile Home program, and the County Rural Residential Owner-Builder fees. All construction projects subject to the Cochise County Building Safety that are not listed in the sections are subject to applicable fees contained in Residential and Non-Residential fee sections:

Sections

1. Administration Fees.....	1
2. Environmental Health Fees.....	1
3. Flood Plain Fees.....	2
4. Right Of Way Fees.....	2
5. Miscellaneous Fees.....	2
6. Office of Manufactured Housing Fees.....	3
7. Planning Fees.....	4
8. Rural Residential Owner/Builder Fees.....	5
9. Subdivision Fees.....	5
10. Zoning Fees.....	7
11. Residential Building Code Fees.....	8
12. Non-Residential Building Code Fees.....	11

Section 1 – Administration

Copies of Documents

Subdivision Regulations	\$5
Zoning Regulations	\$15
Ordinances	\$2
Plans & Area Plans	\$15
Base Maps	\$3.50 each
Assessor's Maps	\$.50 each
Compact Disc	\$6 each
For each Hard Copy Page that is Scanned or Converted into Electronic Format	\$3.30 each
8 ½" X 11" – black & white	\$3.30 each
8 ½" X 11" – color	\$.35 each
11" X 17" enlargement/reduction	\$.50 each
24" X 36" color oversized documents	\$35.00
18" x 24" color oversized documents	\$25.00
(Additional charge for special maps which require research)	

Section 2 – Environmental Health

County Residential Septic Permit	\$235
County Residential Septic Repair Permit	\$145
County Residential Septic Surcharge	\$465
City Residential Septic Permit	\$235
City Residential Septic Repair Permit	\$145
City Residential Septic Surcharge	\$465
County Commercial Septic Permit	\$600
County Commercial Septic Repair Permit	\$145
County Commercial Septic Surcharge	\$100
County Grease Interceptor/Trap (Trade Permit)	\$145

City Commercial Septic Permit		\$600
City Commercial Septic Repair Permit		\$145
City Commercial Septic Surcharge		\$100
City Grease Interceptor/Trap (Trade Permit)		\$145
Composting Toilet Less than 3,000 gallons per day		\$160
Incinerator Electric Toilet		\$350
Well (Plus \$100 for ADWR or \$150 if in "INA" ared)		\$50
County Septic Transfer		\$50
City Septic Transfer		\$50

Section 3 – Floodplain

Floodplain Use Permit - Single Family Dwelling/Manufactured/Mobile Home/Principal Structures		\$150
Floodplain Use Permit- Accessory Structures		\$40

Section 4 – Highway

Right-Of-Way Permit		\$100
---------------------	--	-------

Section 5 – Miscellaneous

Trade Permits (Residential and Non-Residential)		
Water Heater (<u>Residential</u> – <u>New/Upgrade</u> <u>Involving Utility Change</u>)		\$75 \$25
Water Heater (<u>Non-Residential</u>)		\$150 \$25
Cooler, Furnace, Air Conditioner (<u>Residential</u> – <u>New/Upgrade</u> <u>Involving Utility Change</u>)		\$100 \$50
Cooler, Furnace, Air Conditioner (<u>Non-Residential</u> – <u>Involving Utility Change</u>)		\$150
Service Entry (Electrical)		\$100 \$50
<u>Residential</u> Misc. Mechanical, Plumbing & Electrical & <u>Fire</u> (<u>Up to \$1,000</u>)		\$100 \$50
<u>Residential</u> Misc. Mechanical Plumbing & Electrical (\$1001 & up)		Per Construction Value
<u>Non Residential</u> Misc. Mechanical Plumbing & Electrical (<u>Up to \$500</u>)		\$150 \$50
<u>Non Residential</u> Misc. Mechanical Plumbing & Electrical (\$500 & up)		Per Construction Value
Swimming Pool (includes barrier)		\$18.00/ linear

Spa	<u>feet</u> -\$100
Fireplace <u>Residential</u>	\$18.00 /linear feet #-\$50
Fireplace (Non-Residential)	<u>\$100</u> \$50 Per Construction Value
Fire Sprinkler & Fire Alarms	<u>\$.18/square foot</u> Per Construction Value
<u>Solar/PV Systems</u>	Value
<u>For use of outside consultants for plan review and/or inspections</u>	<u>Actual Cost</u>
Replacement of Job Permit / Sign-Off Card	\$75
Re-inspection Fee	\$75
Building Permit Renewal Fee	\$50
Investigation Fee	\$50 per hour (2 hour min. includes travel)
Courtesy / Utility Compliance Fee	\$25 \$50 per hour (2 hour min.) (includes travel)
Inspections for which no Fee is specifically listed	\$50 per hour (2 hour min. includes travel)
Inspections outside normal business hours	\$100 per hour (2 hour min. includes travel)
Walls & Fences over 6' high, Retaining Walls over 4' high (<u>Residential</u>)	<u>\$100</u> \$50
Walls, Fences, & Retaining Walls (<u>Non-residential</u>)	<u>\$100</u> \$50

*Note: Residential walls up to 6' high and 3' high on a corner lot are exempt. An informational permit is required if they are over 3' high on a corner lot. Retaining walls up to 4' high are exempt.

Flat Rate Fees for New Residential Accessory Structures:

Detached Garages (201 s/f to 1000 s/f) * (1) * (5) * (7).....\$100
 Detached Carports (201 s/f to 500 s/f) * (2) * (7).....\$50
 Detached Carports (501 to 1000 s/f) * (5).....\$100
 Sheds and Outbuildings (201 s/f up to 500 s/f) * (7).....\$50
 Sheds and Outbuildings (501 s/f to 1000 s/f) * (5).....\$100
 Attached Carports/Porches/Decks (up to 500 s/f) * (2) * (8).....\$50

All Patios, Carport Enclosures and Patio Enclosures*(3).....\$50
 Animal Shade Covers with No Enclosed Walls (201 s/f and greater)*(4) *(7).....\$50
 Walls and Fences over 6' high, Retaining Walls over 4' high *(6).....\$50
 * Notes:

- 1) *Flat Fee* listed for *Detached Garages* are for basic garages only but it may include one bathroom. Any living space, such as a Bedroom or an Office area, is not allowed under the Flat Fee and will be valued at the standard \$52.00 s/f.
- 2) Flat Fee listed for a *Carport* is for the Cover (roof) and up to two sides.
- 3) Flat Fee listed for *Patio Enclosures* are for the Cover (roof) and / or the Exterior Walls (with any material, windows or doors). If the space is a *Conditioned Living Space (Heat and/or Cooling)* it needs to be valued as a remodel and the Flat Fee does not apply.
- 4) *Animal Shade Covers* are a roof and supports only and are not a complete building.
- 5) Detached Garages, Sheds, Outbuildings, Carports, Decks, Patios and Porches greater than sizes listed under the '*Flat Fees*' will be valued at \$31.46 s/f.
- 6) Walls are exempt up to 6' high and 3' high on a corner lot. An informational permit is required if they are over 3' high on a corner lot. Retaining Walls are exempt up to 4' high.
- 7) No permit required for one-story detached accessory structures provided the floor area does not exceed 200 square feet and has no utilities. Floodplain regulations may apply.
- 8) No permit required for decks less than 30 inches in height above the lowest grade within 5 feet of deck edge.

Section 6 – Department of Fire, Building and Life Safety

Permit Fees

Description	State Issued Permit Fee
Mobile/Manufactured (MFG) Home Installation <i>Includes 3 Inspections</i>	\$350.00 each
Factory Built Building – Residential Installation <i>Includes 3 Inspections</i>	\$450.00 per story (including systems) (Up to \$600)
FB3 – non-residential installation <i>Includes 3 Inspections</i>	\$4.50/linear feet per story (including systems)
REHABILITATED MOBILE HOME CERTIFICATION FEE <i>Includes 2 Inspections</i>	\$180
Renewal Permit (MFG & FB3)	\$82.00

Inspection Fees

Description	Fee
Technical Service	\$82.00 per hour
Rehabilitation – Mobile Home	\$82.00 per hour
Re-Inspection Fee for Manufactured/Mobile Home/ Factory-Built Building	\$82.00 per hour

Section 7 – Planning

SPECIAL USES

Special Use Authorization	\$300 (hearing fee) + permit fee
Special Use Authorization with Concurrent Rezoning Application	\$75 (hearing fee) + permit fee
Subsequent Appeal to the Board of Supervisors	\$300
Special Use Modifications of Approved conditions or Modifications or requests for extensions -other than as specified herein	\$150
All legal publishing fees will be paid by Applicant	Actual cost to be billed

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS

Establishment of new growth area.	\$500
Expansion of existing growth area and/or amendment of plan area designation.	\$200
Review of drainage reports, traffic analyses or other engineering reports: Same fee as listed under Subdivisions.	

MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLANS

0 - 10 acres	\$400
11 - 40 acres	\$500
41 - 100 acres	\$600 + \$10/acre
101 + acre	\$800 + \$10/acre maximum \$8,000
Applicant will pay actual costs for any required special advertising or environmental analysis	

AMENDMENT OF CONDITIONS OR POLICIES OF ADOPTED MDP

Other than substantial amendments requiring re-advertising.	\$200
---	-------

ZONING AMENDMENTS

Amendment of Zoning Regulations (per amendment)	\$250
Rezoning to Less Intensive District	\$250
Rezoning in Conformance with Adopted Master Development Plan	\$250
Other Rezonings:	
to SM-174, SM-87	
to RU-2	\$250
to SR, R, SM-36, SM-18, SM-9	\$350 + \$2/acre (\$1,000 max.)
to All Other Districts	\$400 + \$10/acre (\$2,500 max.)
Other Fees:	\$400 + \$15/acre (\$3,500 max.)
Appeals to Board of Supervisors	
Lot Development Modification Fee	\$300
Home Occupation Permit	\$75
Temporary Use Permits if taken to Board of Supervisors	\$75
	\$150

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Variances	\$300
Appeal of Interpretation/Decisions of Zoning Inspector (Fee will be refunded if the appeal is upheld)	\$150

Section 8 – Rural Residential Owner/Builder

LIMITED INSPECTION WITH PLAN REVIEW OPTION

Single-Family Dwelling		\$700 325 + plan review
Residential Accessory Buildings Up to 500 s/f		\$50
Over 500 s/f		\$100

NO INSPECTION – NO PLAN REVIEW OPTION

Single-Family Dwelling		\$500 75
Residential Accessory Buildings Less than \$2,500 in value		\$200 25

\$2,500 or more in value

\$30035

Section 9 – Subdivisions

Tentative Plat Fee

\$650 + \$20 per lot (Covers 1st & 2nd review - \$150 for each additional review). Covers the costs of County staff participation in one Subdivision Committee meeting. However, if the County's designated consulting engineer commented on the plat and participates in the meeting, the subdivider will pay the full cost charged to the County by the consulting engineer, typically \$350 per meeting which includes travel expenses. See below if additional such meetings are required.

Improvement Plan Review Fee

No charge if Improvement Plans are self-certified by a professional Civil Engineer registered to practice in the State of Arizona. If plans are submitted for County review, the fee would be \$126 per sheet if qualified County staff is available to review them. If necessary, the County will submit plans to the County's designated consulting engineer for their review and the full cost of this review will be paid by the subdivider, typically \$200 per sheet. The subdivider may elect to pay a fee for an "expedited review" of the plans by the County's consulting engineer; the cost for this review would be double the normal fee charged by the consultant, typically \$400 per sheet, and the timeframe for the consultant's expedited review would be half the normal time, typically, less than one week.

Final Plat Fee

\$650 + \$10 per lot (50% to Highway & Floodplain) (Covers 1st and 2nd review - \$150 for each additional review). Covers one Subdivision Committee meeting. However, if the County's designated consulting engineer commented on the plat and participates in the meetings, the subdivider will pay the full cost charged to the County by the consulting engineer, typically \$350 per meeting which includes travel expenses. See below if additional such meetings are required.

Minor Expedited Subdivision Fee

No initial fee, although other fees may ~~will~~ apply (e.g. floodplain, drainage, waivers, etc.).

Drainage Report Review

\$350 for the 1st and 2nd review plus \$116 for each additional review of subsequent revised reports if the reports are reviewed by County Staff. If necessary, the County will submit the report to the County's designated consulting engineer and the full cost of their review will be paid by the subdivider/developer, typically \$500 per review

Subdivision Committee Meetings

No charge for pre-application review of basic or conceptual plats by County staff. The initial Tentative Plat and the Final Plat fee covers the costs of one required Subdivision Committee Meeting each. Any additional necessary Subdivision Committee meeting(s)

will require an additional \$150 per meeting for County staff participation. If the County's consulting engineer commented on the plat and participates in the meeting, the subdivider will pay the full costs charged to the County by the consulting engineer, typically an additional \$350 which includes travel expenses.

Traffic Impact Analyses (TIA) or Traffic Study Review

\$320 for the 1st and 2nd review, plus \$107 for review of each subsequent revision if the report is reviewed by County staff. If necessary, the County will submit the report to the County's designated consulting engineer and the full cost of their review will be paid by the subdivider/developer, typically \$500 per review

OTHER SUBDIVISION FEES

Tentative Plat Time Extensions	\$500
Waivers from Subdivision Regulations	\$100 per waiver
Amended Plats	\$300
Assurance Agreement Time Extensions	\$500
Substitution of Assurance Agreement	\$300
Plat Abandonments	\$300

Section 10 – Zoning

ZONING PERMITS SURCHARGE

For construction begun without a permit:

Permit Issued Before First Enforcement Letter.	\$50 \$-25
Permit Issued After First Enforcement Letter.	\$100
Permit Issued After Second Enforcement Letter.	\$200
Permit Issued After Notice of Hearing.	\$400
Mobile/Manufactured Home Surcharge	\$120

TEMPORARY PERMITS

Temporary Uses	
Residential Temporary Use	\$30
Non Residential Temporary Use	\$100
	\$150

SIGN PERMITS

Billboards 300 square feet or more	\$250 \$100
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Signs less than 15 square feet in size	\$75 \$30
All other sign permits	\$100 \$60
Digital Signs	\$10/square foot. Up to \$500 maximum

Residential Permit Review Fee (This fee must accompany all permit applications & is non-refundable (does not apply to city permits))	\$50 \$15
Residential Permit Revision Fee (For modifications/revisions of issued permits)	\$50 \$15
Non-Residential Permit Review Fee (This fee must accompany all permit applications & is non-refundable (does not apply to city permits))	\$100 \$100
Non-Residential Permit Revision Fee (For modifications/revisions of issued permits)	\$100 \$100
Hearing Officer Appeal Fee	\$300
Non-residential Development Comment Resolution Meetings	\$150 each

However, if the County's consulting engineer commented on the Development Plan & participates in the meeting, the developer will pay the full costs charged to the County by the consulting engineer, typically an additional \$350 per meeting which includes travel expenses.

Rural Addressing Fees

Filing of Road Naming/Renaming Petition (This fee is waived if action is initiated by Rural Addressing)	\$150
Fee per Road Sign Changed by Petition (this fee is waived if action is initiated by Rural Addressing)	\$135
Atlas CD	\$20
RURAL ADDRESSING REVIEW FEE (This fee must accompany all permit applications and is non-refundable (does not apply to city permits)).	\$15 \$15

NON-RESIDENTIAL USES

Change of Use	\$150
Accessory structures	\$100
All other non-residential uses:	
Floor Area 0-9,999 square feet	\$150 \$150
10,000 square foot & greater	\$300 \$300

Section 11 – Residential Building Code Fees

Residential Permit and Plan Review Fees: There is a four-step process to determine the Total Project Fee amount.
DETERMINATION OF CONSTRUCTION VALUES (Step 1):

First, the total valuation of the proposed construction work needs to be established. For New structures and Additions, this is determined by the square foot size of the structure (measured from the exterior). The values listed for New complete structures and

additions include the permit fees for the entire project, including miscellaneous trades (e.g. Electrical, Plumbing, and Mechanical). In the case of Remodeling Work it would be based on the documented material and labor costs of the project.

New Residential One and Two Family Homes and Additions – Valuation Rates:

Residential Structures Valuation Rate:		\$91.56 \$52.00 per square foot (includes conditioned Arizona Rooms)
Attached Garages	square foot	\$31.46 \$39.28 per
Basements	square foot	\$15.00 \$18.00 per
Detached Garages, Sheds, Outbuildings, Carports, Decks, Patios, & Porches	square foot	\$31.46 \$39.28 per
For construction begun without a permit.		Additional Permit Fee Minus Plan Review
Residential Remodel Work & Phased Construction		Use Contract Value *
Repairs, Alterations, Renovations, Restorations, Shell Only Structures & Foundation Only		Use Contract Value *

*Projects shall have values determined by proven actual project cost documents (copy of signed Contracts and/or Material & Labor estimates based on fair market retail value). These Material and Labor values should include all trade costs (e.g. Carpentry, Electrical, Plumbing and Mechanical etc.).

*No permit required for one-story detached accessory structures provided the floor area does not exceed 200-square feet and no utilities. Floodplain regulations may apply.

DETERMINATION OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE TO BE APPLIED (Step 2):

Second, a Building Permit Fee is then applied to the valuation of the construction work, obtained in Step One. The only exceptions would be when a permit is using previously approved plans.

After the Valuation of the proposed construction work has been determined, a Building Permit Fee is then determined from the Fee Schedule below. Be sure to apply the Fees that are listed below the table when applicable.

Total Valuation of Work	Fee Amount
Base Permit Fee (up to \$1000.00 work value)	\$21.00 \$26.25
\$1000 to \$2000	\$34.75 \$43.44 for the first \$1000 plus \$2.75 \$3.43 each additional \$100, or fraction thereof.
\$2001 to \$25,000	\$62.25 \$77.10 for the first \$2000 plus \$12.50 \$15.62 each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.

\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$349.75 <u>\$ 437.19</u> for the first \$50,000 plus \$6.25 <u>\$11.25</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$574.75 <u>\$ 18.44</u> for the first \$50,000 plus \$6.25 <u>\$7.81</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$887.25 <u>\$ 1109.06</u> for the first \$100,000 plus \$5.00 <u>\$6.25</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$500,001 to \$1,00,000	\$2,887.25 <u>\$ 3609.06</u> for the first \$500,000 plus \$4.25 <u>\$5.31</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$1,000,001 & Up	\$5012.25 <u>\$ 6265.53</u> for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$2.75 <u>\$3.44</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.

\$1000 Exemption – If proposed residential construction is less than \$1000 in market value (defined as the normal retail value of materials and labor performed) a permit is not required, unless building code review is required such as electrical or plumbing. It is suggested, however, that you contact the Planning Department at (520) 432-9240 to ensure that the size and placement of the structures comply with the Zoning Regulations and other pertinent County requirements. ~~Also~~Also, see list of residential exemptions in Article 17 of the Zoning Regulations.

PLAN REVIEW FEE (Step 3):

Plan Review Fees are in addition to Permit Fees and are based on a percentage of the Building Permit Fee charged. The review fee charged reflects the time spent in the review of construction plans and submittal information. The Plan Review Fee entitles the applicant to three submissions and reviews of the documents submitted. If the applicant is unable to obtain approval of his application with these three attempts, an additional plan review fee rate of \$50.00 per hour (~~1~~2 ~~hour~~ 1-hour min) will be assessed as noted below.

Residential Plan Review Fee: <u>Includes three reviews</u>	25% <u>65%</u> of the Building Permit Fee (Up to & including four-plex)
Additional Plan Review Fees: Required by changes, additions or revisions to plans as requested by the applicant; or for those required reviews in addition to the three reviews allowed under the Plan Review Fee listed above.	\$50.00 per hour (1 <u>2</u> <u>1</u> hour minimum)

Building Permit and Plan Review Notes:

- 1) No subsequent step in the permit process shall be undertaken without all fees being paid.

- 2) Whenever any work for which a permit is required by the building code has been commenced without first obtaining said permit, a special investigation shall be made before a permit may be issued for such work. A Work without Permit Fee shall be collected whether or not a permit is then or subsequently issued. The Work without Permit fee is an amount equal to the Building Permit Fee, in addition to the normal required permit fee, with a minimum penalty of \$100.00 and a maximum of \$2500.00.
- 3) The square footage for a Residential 'Alternative Construction' type structure, with increased exterior wall thickness, shall be measured from an assumed 8" wall thickness.
- 4) ~~Complete Plans (all trades) still need to be submitted for review on Flat Rate Fees as required.~~

TOTAL PROJECT FEE (Step 4):

Fourth, apply Residential Zoning Review, ~~Rural Addressing~~ and other applicable fees to the *Total Building Permit Fee* to determine the *Total Project Fee*. To determine the *Total Project Fees* add any applicable miscellaneous fees such as Work without Permit Fee, as well as Residential Zoning Review, ~~Rural Addressing~~, and any other departmental fees to the *Total Building Permit Fee*.

(When the County's consulting engineer is utilized for plan reviews or meetings, the owner will pay the full cost charged to the County by the consulting engineer.)

Example:

1. 1,000 s/f house @ \$91.50 = \$91,500 valuation
2. \$741.44 + (\$7.81 x 41) = \$1,061.65 (fee amount)
3. Plan Review Fee (65% of fee amount) = \$1061.65 + \$690.08 = \$1,751.73 Total Building Permit Fee
4. Add on any additional or miscellaneous fees (e.g. 12x20 foot swimming pool at \$18 per l/f & water heater at \$75) = 1,152 + 75 + 1,751.73 = \$2,978.73 Total Project Fee

Section 12 – Non-Residential Building Code Fees

Non-Residential Permit and Plan Review Fees:

There is a four-step process to determine the *Total Project Fee* amount.

DETERMINATION OF CONSTRUCTION VALUES (Step 1):

For construction begun without a permit.

Additional Permit Fee Minus Plan Review

First, the total valuation of the proposed construction work needs to be established. For New Structures and Additions this is determined by the square foot size and construction type of the structure (measured from the exterior) using the ICC Cost Schedule that follows. In the case of Remodeling it would be based on the documented material and labor costs of the project.

New – Non-Residential and Other than One and Two Family Structures:

All new structures, other than those that are One and Two Family Residential Structures, shall have the square foot valuation applied that is listed on the most current published International Code Councils – 'Construction Cost Schedule', released semi-annually, based on the type of construction.

Non-Residential Remodel Work and Phased Construction:

Repairs, Alterations, Renovations, Restorations, Shell Only Structures and Tenant Fit-Ups shall have values determined by proven actual project cost documents (copy of signed Contracts and/or material and labor estimates based on fair market retail value). These Material and Labor Values should include all trade costs (e.g. Carpentry, Electrical, Plumbing, and Mechanical etc.).

Square Foot Construction Costs a,b,c,d

<u>Group (2012 International Building Code)</u>	<u>IA</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IIA</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIIA</u>	<u>IIIB</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>VA</u>	<u>VB</u>
A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	224.49	217.12	211.82	202.96	190.83	185.33	196.14	174.43	167.83
A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	205.71	198.34	193.04	184.18	172.15	166.65	177.36	155.75	149.15
A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	177.15	172.12	167.31	160.58	150.83	146.74	154.65	136.68	132.81
A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	176.15	171.12	165.31	159.58	148.83	145.74	153.65	134.68	131.81
A-3 Assembly, churches	207.73	200.36	195.06	186.20	174.41	168.91	179.38	158.02	151.41
A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	173.36	165.99	159.69	151.83	138.90	134.40	145.01	122.50	116.89
A-4 Assembly, arenas	204.71	197.34	191.04	183.18	170.15	165.65	176.36	153.75	148.15
B Business	179.29	172.71	166.96	158.70	144.63	139.20	152.43	126.93	121.32
E Educational	192.11	185.49	180.05	171.90	160.09	151.62	165.97	139.90	135.35
F-1 Factory & industrial, moderate hazard	108.42	103.32	97.18	93.38	83.24	79.62	89.22	68.69	64.39
F-2 Factory & industrial, low hazard	107.42	102.32	97.18	92.38	83.24	78.62	88.22	68.69	63.39
H-1 High Hazard, explosives	101.53	96.44	91.29	86.49	77.57	72.95	82.34	63.02	N.P.
H234 High Hazard	101.53	96.44	91.29	86.49	77.57	72.95	82.34	63.02	57.71
H-5 HPM	179.29	172.71	166.96	158.70	144.63	139.20	152.43	126.93	121.32
I-2 Institutional, hospitals	302.44	295.85	290.11	281.84	266.80	N.P.	275.58	249.09	N.P.
I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	209.38	202.79	197.05	188.78	175.72	N.P.	182.52	158.01	N.P.
I-3 Institutional, restrained	204.27	197.68	191.94	183.67	171.10	164.68	177.41	153.40	145.80
I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	177.76	171.50	166.52	159.45	146.31	142.45	159.13	131.29	126.72
M Mercantile	132.04	127.01	121.20	115.47	105.47	102.39	109.54	91.33	88.45

R-1 Residential, hotels	<u>179.14</u>	<u>172.89</u>	<u>167.90</u>	<u>160.83</u>	<u>147.95</u>	<u>144.10</u>	<u>160.52</u>	<u>132.93</u>	<u>128.36</u>
R-2 Residential, multiple family	<u>150.25</u>	<u>143.99</u>	<u>139.01</u>	<u>131.94</u>	<u>119.77</u>	<u>115.91</u>	<u>131.62</u>	<u>104.74</u>	<u>100.18</u>
R-3 Residential	<u>141.80</u>	<u>137.90</u>	<u>134.46</u>	<u>131.00</u>	<u>125.88</u>	<u>122.71</u>	<u>128.29</u>	<u>117.71</u>	<u>110.29</u>
R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	<u>177.76</u>	<u>171.50</u>	<u>166.52</u>	<u>159.45</u>	<u>146.31</u>	<u>142.45</u>	<u>159.13</u>	<u>131.29</u>	<u>126.72</u>
S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	<u>100.53</u>	<u>95.44</u>	<u>89.29</u>	<u>85.49</u>	<u>75.57</u>	<u>71.95</u>	<u>81.34</u>	<u>61.02</u>	<u>56.71</u>
S-2 Storage, low hazard	<u>99.53</u>	<u>94.44</u>	<u>89.29</u>	<u>84.49</u>	<u>75.57</u>	<u>70.95</u>	<u>80.34</u>	<u>61.02</u>	<u>55.71</u>
U Utility, miscellaneous	<u>75.59</u>	<u>71.22</u>	<u>66.78</u>	<u>63.37</u>	<u>56.99</u>	<u>53.22</u>	<u>60.41</u>	<u>44.60</u>	<u>42.48</u>

- Unfinished basements (all use groups) = \$18.00 per square foot.##
- For shell only buildings deduct 20 percent
- PV Solar at County Cost, Consulting fees may apply
- Wind Turbine based on project value

DETERMINATION OF BUILDING PERMIT FEE TO BE APPLIED (Step 2):

After the Valuation of the proposed construction work has been determined by one of the approved methods, a Building Permit Fee is then applied from the below fee schedule.

Total Valuation of Work	Fee Amount
\$1 to \$500	\$25.00 <u>\$31.00</u>
\$501 to \$2,000	\$25.00 <u>\$31.00</u> for the first \$500 plus \$3.45 <u>4.80</u> each additional \$100, or fraction thereof.
\$2001 to \$25,000	\$76.75 <u>\$103.00</u> for the first \$2000 plus \$15.00 <u>18.00</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$421.75 <u>\$517.00</u> for the first \$25,000 plus \$11.00 <u>14.00</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$695.75 <u>\$867.00</u> for the first \$50,000 plus \$7.50 <u>9.00</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$1071.75 <u>\$1317.00</u> for the first \$100,000 plus \$6.25 <u>8.50</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$3571.75 <u>\$4717.00</u> for the first \$500,000 plus \$5.25 <u>7.50</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.
\$1,000,001 & Up	\$6196.75 <u>\$8467.00</u> for the first \$1,000,000 plus \$3.75 <u>4.50</u> each additional \$1000, or fraction thereof.

PLAN REVIEW FEE (Step 3):

Plan Review Fees are in addition to Permit Fees and are based on a percentage of the Building Permit Fee charged. The review fee charged reflects the time spend in the review of construction plans and submittal information. The Plan Review Fee entitles the applicant to three submissions and reviews of the documents submitted. If the applicant is unable to obtain approval of his application with these three attempts, an additional plan review fee rate of \$50.00 per hour (142.1 hour min) will be assessed as noted below.

Non-Residential Plan Review (includes three reviews)	Fee: 40 65% of the Building Permit Fee
Additional Plan Review Fees:	Required by changes, additions or revisions to plans as requested by the applicant; or for those required reviews in addition to the three reviews allowed under the Plan Review Fee listed above. \$50.00 per hour (1 2.1 hour minimum)

Building Permit and Plan Review Notes:

- 1) No subsequent step in the permit process shall be undertaken without all fees being paid.
- 2) Whenever any work for which a permit is required by the building code has been commenced without first obtaining said permit, a special investigation shall be made before a permit may be issued for such work. A Work without Permit Fee shall be collected whether or not a permit is then or subsequently issued. The Work without Permit Fee is an amount equal to the Building Permit Fee, in addition to the normal required permit fee, with a minimum penalty of \$100.00 and a maximum of \$2500.00.
- 3) The square footage for a Residential 'Alternative Construction' type structure, with increased exterior wall thickness, shall be measured from an assumed 8" wall thickness
- 4) ~~Complete Plans (all trades) still need to be submitted for review on Flat Rate Fees as required.~~

TOTAL PROJECT FEE (Step 4):

Fourth, apply Non-Residential Zoning Review, ~~Rural Addressing~~, and other applicable fees to the Total Building Permit Fee to determine the Total Project Fee. To determine the Total Project Fees add any applicable miscellaneous fees such as Work without Permit Fee, as well as Residential Zoning Review, ~~Rural Addressing~~, and any other departmental fees to the Total Building Permit Fee. (Example on next page).

Example:

1. 1,000 square foot# B occupancy type VB construction Building @121.32 / square foot.# = \$121,320.00 Valuation
2. \$1317.00 + (8.50 x 22) = \$1504.00 (fee amount)
3. Plan Review Fee (65% of fee amount) = \$977.60 + \$1504 = \$2481.60 Total Building Permit Fee
4. Add on any additional or miscellaneous fees

When the County's consulting engineer is utilized for plan reviews or meetings, the owner will pay the full cost charged to the County by the consulting engineer, same fee as listed under Development.

PERMIT AND PLAN REVIEW FEES

	<i>PERMIT FEES PER SQ. FT. VALUE</i>		
COUNTY	SFR	GARAGES, PATIO, ETC.	PLAN REVIEW % OF PERMIT FEES
Cochise	\$52.00	\$31.46	25%/40%
Gila	\$86.37	\$15.00	65%
Graham	\$85.00	\$32.00	65%
Greenlee	\$45.00	\$45.00	65%
Pima	\$101.95	\$39.61	65%
Santa Cruz	\$107.08	\$15.00	35%
Yuma	\$58.55	\$21.14	65%
CITY			
Avondale	\$110.29	\$42.48	65%
Benson	\$94.06	\$36.91	65%
Bisbee	\$73.00	\$36.50	65%
Maricopa City	\$110.29	\$42.48	65%
Nogales	\$110.29	\$14.00	65%
Sierra Vista	\$110.29	\$42.06	25%
Yuma	\$91.00	\$36.00	65%